TANJORE SARASVATI MAHAL SERIES No. 133.

A GRAMMAR OF

THE COMMON DIALECT OF THE TAMIL LANGUAGE

Called

கொடுந்தமிழ்

By

CONSTANTIUS JOSEPH BESCHI

Translated From The Original Latin By

GEORGE WILLIAM MAHON



REPRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
DIRECTOR TMSSM LIBRARY

1997] [Price Rs. 35-00

TANJORE SARASVATI MAHAL SERIES No. 133.

A GRAMMAR OF

THE COMMON DIALECT OF THE TAMIL LANGUAGE

Called

கொடுந்தமிழ்

By

CONSTANTIUS JOSEPH BESCHI

Translated From The Original Latin By

GEORGE WILLIAM MAHON



REPRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
DIRECTOR TMSSM LIBRARY

1997] [Price Rs. 36-00

Bibliographical Data

Title of the Book	:	A Grammar of the Common Dialect of the Tamil Language
Publisher	:	Director Sarasvati Mahal Library.
Publication No.	:	133
Languager	:	English
,, Translation	:	Tamil
Edition	:	II Edition
Date of Publication	:	Feb, 1997
Paper used	:	14.2 Kg.
Size of the Book	:	21 x 14 cm.
Printing type used	:	10 pt & 12 pt
Number of Pages	:	248 + 20
No. of copies	:	500
Price	:	Rs. 35-00
Printer	:	Gajendra Printers 57, South Car Street Chidambaram.
Binding	:	Card Board
Subject	:	TAMIL GRAMMAR

Wrapper Page of the Original Printed Edition.

A GRAMMAR

OF THE COMMON DIALECT OF THE TAMUL LANGUAGE

CALLED

கொடுந்தமிழ்

By

CONSTANTIUS JOSEPH BESCHI,

Popularly known as

வீரமாமுனிவர்

Author of

தொன்னூல் விளக்கம்

and about 21 other Learned Works on Tamil

Together with

The Author's Biographical Sketch in English

By

GEORGE WILLIAM MAHON

LATE FELLOW OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, OXFORD

Inner Title Page of the Original Printed Edition.

A GRAMMAR

OF THE COMMON DIALECT OF THE TAMUL LANGUAGE.

Called

கொடுந்தமிழ்

COMPOSED FOR THE USE OF THE MISSIONARIES
OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS,

By

CONSTANTIUS JOSEPH BESCHI,
MISSIONARY OF
THE SAID SOCIETY IN THE DISTRICT OF MADURA

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN BY
GEORGE WILLIAM MAHON, A.M.
GARRISON CHAPLAIN, FORT ST. GEORGE, MADRAS,
AND LATE FELLOW OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, OXFORD.

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE

This valuable *vad-e-mecum* of the Common Dialect of the Tamil Language, which was very popular among foreign students of Tamil during the last century, may be considered as a pioneer work on modern lines in the study of Tamil. It has done a great service in expanding the orbit of international understanding of Tamil culture. This was originally written in Latin by the famous Jesuit missionary, Constantius Joseph Beschi, a great lexicographer, grammarian, and poet, who is popularly known as Viramamunivar, the author of Saturakaradi, Thonnul Vilakkam and Thembavani.

A brief acquaintance with the life and achievements of the author, Rev. Father Beschi, will help the reader to appreciate the value of the literary adventure of his, since such a publication in Tamil in those early years, by a Jesuit missionary is no less than an adventure. We therefore reproduce below Benjamin Babington's brief account of Father Beschi, taken from the Tamil manuscripts in his possession and published in the year 1822.

"Viramamooni of the great Champion Devotee, as Beschi is surnamed by the Tamuls, was a native of Italy, and one of the religious order of Jesuits. Having been appointed by the Pope to the East India Mission, he arrived in 1700, at the city of Goa, on the Western coast. He thence proceeded to Avoor, in the district of Trichinopoly, where he studied the Tamil language in both its dialects, as well as the Sanskrit and Teloogoo; and with a view to public employment, which it was ever the Jesuit policy to seek in order to promote their religious views, he made himself master of the Hindostannee and Persian. It is probable that he held political offices in the earlier part of his life, for we can hardly suppose him to have risen at once to the appointment

of Divan, which he held under the celebrated Chunda Saheb, during his rule as Nabob of Trichinopoly, especially as Chunda Saheb did not assume the government of that place until the death of the Rajah, which happened in the year 1736.

From the moment of his arrival in India, he, in conformity with Hindoo custom, abandoned the use of animal food, and employed Brahmans to prepare his meals. He adopted the habit of a religious devotee, and on his visitations to his flock assumed all the pomp and pageantry with which Hindoo Gooroos usually travel. He founded a church at Konangooppam Ariyanoor, in the district of Baroor, and my MS. notices particularly a picture of the Madonna and the child Jesus, which he caused to be painted at Manilla and set up in that church. It was in honour of this Madonna, of her husband Joseph and the Lord Jesus, that he composed the Sacred Poem called Tembavani: which, vying in length with the Ilaid itself, is by far the most celebrated and most voluminous of his works. It contains 3615 tetrasticks, each of which is furnished with a prose interpretation; and, to judge from the only Padalam or Canto which I have had an opportunity of reading, where the murder of the innocents is described, its merits are not overrated. Viramamooni also founded a church at Tirookavaloor, a name which he gave to the town of Vadoogapet, in the district of Ariyallor, and on the Madonna there he composed three Poems; Tirookavaloor Kalambagam. Anneiyajoongal Andadi, and Adeikala Malei—The following are the most important of the remaining works of this author; which, with exceptions that will be noticed, are extant only in MS.

Kiteri Ammal Ammanei, a poem. Vediyarojookkam, a work in prose; where, as the name implies, the duties of

one who has devoted his life to religion are laid down. Veda Vilakkam, also in prose: which, from the title (the light of the gospel), I presume to contain some doctrinal exposition of the Roman Catholic Faith. A Dictionary, Tamul and French; another Tamul and Portuguese; a third Tamul and Latin. Sadoor Agharadi, or the Four Dictionaries; a Tamul work relating to the higher dialect of philological works he has furnished Tonnool Vilakkam: a Tamul Grammar of the higher dialect, written in Latin. Of this I made a Translation in 1814; which, having become the property of the Madras Government, is now, as I learn, under course of publication at their College Press. Clavis Humaniorum Tamulici Idiomatis; a second Grammatical Treatise in Latin, relating to the higher dialect. A Latin Grammar of the common dialect; which has been published at the College Press at Madras; and of which a faulty and vulgar translation has long been before the public.

Such were the literary labours of Beschi, and he was distinguished as much for his piety and benevolence as for his learning. To the conversion of idolators his principal efforts were of course directed, and they are said to have been uncommonly successful. Prefect master of Hindoo science, opinions and prejudices, he was eminenty qualified to expose the fallacies of their doctrine, ard the absurdities of their religious practices; and, accordingly, he is much extolled for the triumphs which he obtained, in those controversial disputations which are so frequent among the learned in India, and for the almost miraculous skill which he displayed, in solving various enigmatical questions which his adversaries propounded, for his embarrassment.

It remains a subject of regret, that talents so rare, should have been devoted to the promotion of a religion scarcely less replete with error, than that which it supplanted: but we may draw this practical conclusion from Beschi's success, that a thorough acquaintance, with Hindoo learning and a ready compliance, in matters of indifference, with Hindoo customs, are powerful human means, to which the Jesuits owed much of their success, and which should not, as is too much the case, be despised by those who undertake the task of conversion in a better cause. Viramamooni continued to hold the office of Divan, in Trichinopoly, until the year 1740; when that city being besieged by the Mahratta army, under Morary Rao, and Chunda Saheb being taken prisoner, he contrived to effect his escape, and filed to the city of Gayal Patanam, then belonging to the Dutch. He there remained, in the service of the church, until 1742, when he was carried off by an illness, the particulars of which are not stated. His name is still remembered in Gayal Patanam, and massess continue to be offered up for the salvation o f his soul, in that city and its neighbourhood."

It will be gratifying to our readers to know that Maharaja Serfoji was keenly interested in the study of Tamil and of the contribution of western savants towards spreading the understanding of Tam'l, as is evidenced by the Raja's collection of several works of Viramamunivar for his private library which is preserved in Sarasvati Mahal.

Though much in demand, the work has been out of print for more than a century and quarter. There is an earlier translation in English of this work by Christopher Henry Horst to which a reference is made by George William Mahon in the preface to his translation. On the

increased wake of international interest in Tamil, consequent on the recent Tamil world conferences in India and abroad, we hope this publication will help in advancing the study of Tamil, outside Tamil land.

We intend this publication to be the first of a series of reprints of similar old works in English on Tamil Grammar which are enlisted below:

1. A True and Exact Description of the Most celebrated East-India Coast of Malabar and Coromandel as also of the Island of Ceylon. Also a most Circumstantial and complete Account of the Idolatry of the Pagans in the East-Indies...Translated from the High Dutch in A Collection of Voyages and Travels, 4 vols. Vol. III Printed for Awnsham and John Churchill, London 1704. 561-901. P.

2. BESCHI, JOSEPH CONSTANTINE. Clavis humaniorum litterarum sublimioris tamulici idiomatis auctore R.P.Constantio Josepho Beschio Societatis Jesu, in Madurensi Regno Missionario. Printed for A. Burnell by the Evangelical Lutheran Mission Press, Tranquebar, 1876. will 171 P. (Grammar of Literary Tamil).

3. A Grammar of the High Dialect of the Tamil Language Termed Shen-Tamil; to which is added an introduction to Tamil Poetry. By the Reverand Father. C.J. Beschi, Jesuit Missionary in the Kingdom of Madura. Translated from the Original Latin by Benjamin Guy Babington. Printed at the College Press, Madras. 1822. xii.V. 177 P.

4. ENGLISH MISSIONARIES OF MADRAS. A Grammar for Learning the principles of the Malabar Languages. Properly called Tamil or the Tamulian Language. Vepery, near Madras. 1778.63 P, (2nd Ed. 1789. 63 P.)

5. GRAUL, KARL. Outline of Tamil Grammar. Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig 1856. 101 P.

6. LAZARUS JOHN, A Tamil Grammar Designed for use in Colleges and Schools. John Sno and Co., Trubner and Co., London, 1878. vii. 230 P.

7. RHENIUS. C.T.E. A Grammar of the Tamil Language with an Appendix. Printed at the Church Mission Press, Madras. 1836 ix, vi, 294 P.

8. ZIEGENBALG, BARTHOLOMAEUS. Grammatica Damulica (1716) xii, 128 P. (Tamil Grammar).

We have been faced with some practical difficulties in the printing of this work. Some pages in the last portion of the work are interspersed with old letters and symbols for numerals, measures and weights, which were commonly in vogue in Tamil script till the last century. These symbols, not being in current use, it became impossible to secure the appropriate types for these. In our desire not to deprive our readers of an acquaintance with those scripts, as used in the original, we have arranged to write them out, as neatly as possible. We hope that the readers will approve of this improvisation and accept our apologies for the same.

We are profoundly grateful to Mr. N. Mahalingam, B.Sc., M.I.E., leading industrialist and great patron and promoter of humanistic and scientific studies, particularly of Tamil, for his generous gift to our library of the manuscript copy of the original printed edition of this book, which has served as the basis of this publication and of some other similar works which are not available at present.

We are thankful to Vidvan A. Shanmugasundaram Pillai, B.A., for the efficient manner in which he has seen this reprint through the press and also to our Librarian Prof. V. Gopala Iyengar, M.A., for his general supervision of our publications. We thank Messrs. Lawley Printers, Thanjavur for their neat execution of this work.

We record here our heart-felt thanks in an abundant measure to the Government of Tamil Nadu for the munificent grants to the Library which render such publications possible.

THANJAVUR,
21—1—1971.

N. KANDASWAMY,
Honorary Secretary,
T.M.S.S.M. Library.

———

Constantius Joseph Beschi, the Author of the following Grammar, was a Native of Italy, and from an early age was dedicated to the service of the Church. He was educated at Rome, and in due time became a Professed Brother of the Order of Jesuits. His great natural endowments, and extraordinary facility in the attainment of languages, soon pointed him out as a fit person to be employed in the Indian Mission: and in "holy obedience" to his vows, he embarked for the East, and arrived at Goa in the year 1707.

In this place, rendered sacred to his mind by the memory of Francis Xavier, Beschi lost none of that zeal for his Order and for the Church, with which previous associations had imbued him. Brought for the first time in immediate contact with heathen idolatry, he was eager to commence his duties as a Christian Missionary. He lost no time therefore in proceeding to Madura.

Scarcely a century had elapsed, since Robert de Nobili, a Brother of the same Order, and Nephew to the famous Cardinal Bellarmin, had landed at the same spot, and directing his steps Southward, had established the Mission at Madura. The peculiarities of the people amongst whom he found himself, and the little progress made in their conversion by his predecessors, led him to reflect deeply, upon the probable causes for those difficulties, which, in India alone, appeared to obstruct the reception of the True Faith. With this view he studied thoroughly the language, customs,

philosophy and religion of the Hindoos; and with the approbation of his Provincial, and the benediction of the Archbishop of Cranganore, he proceeded to put in practice the plan he had devised. Avoiding the society of Europeans, he adopted the customs and dress of the Brahmins; declared himself of an illustrious *caste;* assumed the name of Tatouva Podagar Swami; and, by adapting himself to the prejudices and traditions of the people, he soon acquired their reverence, and respectful attention, By such means, De Nobili was wonderfully successful in ingrafting an outward profession of Christianity upon the stock of heathenism: in a short time, seventy Brahmins had been baptized and become followers of the new Gooroo. In spite of the expressed disapprobation of many influential members of his own Church, and "a letter full of reproaches" from his Uncle, the Cardinal, he still persisted in the plan he had entered on; and after having, according to some authorities, converted "nearly one hundred thousand" persons to the Faith, he died, "venerated as a Saint" at the age of seventy-six.

Stimulated by this extraordinary example, Beschi, after full consideration, determined to pursue the same method. He studied the languages, science and religion of the people; familiarised himself with their modes of thought; entered in to their prejudices; and, after full preparation, assuming the name of Viramamuni, he adopted their habits, and imitated their customs, and costume. As regards the latter, well knowing the influence of outward impressions on simple

minds, he affected a showy and imposing magnificence. His dress was of a light purple color, with a waist-band of the same; his turban was white, veiled with purple; embroidered Turkish slippers covered his feet; in his hand he carried a long cane, which aided him in displaying a mysterious ring, composed of five metals, which he wore upon his finger. His earrings, of rubies and pearls, were beautiful and costly. When he travelled, his palanquin was preceded by a man bearing an umbreela of purple silk, surmounted by a golden ball; at each side, ran men with magnificent fans of peacock's feathers; the holy man reclined in the midst of all this splendor, upon a tiger's skin, remarkable for its beauty, which, when he alighted, was placed upon the ground for him to sit upon.

Beschi was highly skilled as a linguist. In addition to Italian, his mother tongue, he had mastered Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Portuguese, Spanish and French; and of the Indian languages, he was learned in the Sanscrit, Tamul, Teloogoo, Hindostani and Persian. The two latter he is stated to have acquired in the short space of three months, for the express purpose of obtaining an interview with Chunda Saib, the Nabob; who was so astonished at his genius, that he presented him with a palanquin; bestowed on him the name of Ismatti Sunnyasi; and gave him, for his maintenance, the four villages, Bokalum, Malwai, Arasur and Nullur, in the Trichinopoly District, which yielded a revenue of twelve thousand rupees per annum. In addition, the Nabob made him his Dewan; in which character Beschi occasionally made official journeys; on which occasions he rode a white

or black horse richly caprisoned, and was accompanied by men with silver staves, an escort of thirty horsemen, camels, drums, fifes, elephants bearing his tents, &c. &c. Inconsistent as all this wordly magnificence was with the humble character of a Christian Missionary, Beschi's indefatigable energies enabled him to render in conducive to the end he had in view. He was liberal to the poor; attentive to the education of youth; and always ready to promote the temporal welfare of his dependents.

He found time also to write various works in the Tamul Language, with the view of promoting the interests of his Faith. Amongst these may be named.

1. *Tembavani.* a fabulous, mythological poem in 30 Cantos, on Scriptural Subjects.
2. *Tirucalavar Columbacum.*
3. *Adeikala Malei.*
4. *Calivenba.*— These three are in honor of the Virgin.
5. *Annei Azengal Andathi.* The Dolors of the Virgin.
6. *Kitteri Ammal Ammanei.* The life and death of a Spanish Virgin and Saint.
7. *Veythe Orelookkum.* Instruction to Catechists.
8. *Vedha Vilaccam.* Illustration of Religion: Published 1728.
9. *Pedagamaruttal.*
10. *Gnana Unerrttal.* Instruction of Wisdom.
11. *Tiruchabei Canidam,* On Astronomy.
12. *Tamul Grammar of the High Dialect.*
13. *Clavis Humaniorum Tamulica Idiomatis.* In M.S.
14. *Vamen Cadei,* A story, with a Latin translation. In M.S.
15. *Paramarta Guru Cadei,* A Tale in Low Tamul.

வெளியீட்டாளர் முகவுரை

சரசுவதி மகால் நூலகத்தின் அரிய வெளியீடு களில் ஒன்றான 'கொடுந்தமிழ்' என்னும் வீரமா முனிவர் இயற்றிய விழுமிய இலக்கண நூல், தற்பொழுது இரண்டாம் பதிப்பாக வெளியிடப்படு கின்றது.

இலத்தீன் மொழியில் முதலில் எழுதப்பட்டுப் பின்னர் ஆங்கிலத்தில் மொழிபெயர்க்கப்பட்ட இந்நூல் அருமையும் பெருமையும் வாய்ந்த தமிழ் இலக்கண நூலாகும்.

1971-இல் சரசுவதி மகால் நூலக வழி இந்நூலின் முதற்பதிப்பு வெளிவந்தது. முதற்பதிப்பாக அக்கால் நமது நூலக வழி மலர்கையிலேயே, மறுபிரசுர முதற் பதிப்பாக அது அமைந்தமை குறிப்பிடத்தக்கது.

தமிழ் கற்கும் அயன்மொழி மாணவர்க்கும், தமிழின் பால் ஈடுபாடுகொள்ளும் பிற மொழியினர்க்கும் அரும் பயன் அளிக்கும் இந்நூல் சரசுவதி மகால் நூலகத்தின் சிறப்பு வெளியீடுகளில் ஒன்றாகும்.

இந்நூல் இப்பொழுது ஆர்வலர்களின் விழைவையும் தேவையையும் கருதி மீண்டும் வெளியிடப்படுகின்றது.

இந்நூல் வெளியீட்டுக்குத் தேவையான நிதி உதவியை நல்கியுள்ள நடுவண் அரசுக்கு எனது மனமார்ந்த நன்றியை உரித்தாக்கி மகிழ்கின்றேன்.

இவ்வெளியீடு நன்முறையில் வெளிவர ஆவன செய்துள்ள சரசுவதி மகால் நூலக நிருவாக அலுவலர் திரு.எம். உத்திராபதி அவர்களுக்கும், நூலக வெளியீட்டு மேலாளர் திரு. அ. பஞ்சநாதன் அவர்களுக்கும் என் பாராட்டுகள்.

நூல் அச்சுப்பணியைச் செம்மையுற நிறைவு செய்துள்ள சிதம்பரம் கஜேந்திரா அச்சகத்தார்க்கும், இந்நூல் நன்முறையில் வெளிவரத் துணைநின்ற ஏனையோர்க்கும், என் பாராட்டுகள்.

நூலுலகம் இவ் வெளியீட்டுக்குப் பெருவரவேற்பினை நல்குதல் திண்ணம்.

வி.கு. ஜெயக்கொடி, இ.ஆ.ப.,
மாவட்ட ஆட்சித் தலைவர்
மற்றும்
இயக்குநர்,
சரசுவதி மகால் நூலகம்

தஞ்சாவூர்
24—2—97

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

To the Religious Candidates of the Tamul language

CONSTANT JOSEPH BESCHI

WISHES MUCH HEALTH IN THE LORD.

I have often heard persons finding fault with the common Grammar of the Tamul Language; as if many things were wanting in it, and some faulty. Yet, as if they all, distrusted their own powers, or feared the offence of novelty, or even intent on better things, disdained this light labor, no one has seemed willing hitherto to put his hand to this work. And doubtless so great is the offence of novelty, that it seems to be allowed to every one to blame what is new, testing talent as they do wine; even under this very pretext, that a work not hardened by the detractions of reproof might grow obsolete. I however make very light of this mark: provided no one shall dare to accuse this short lucubration of mine, as a finding fault with the labor of my predecessors. Nor, most certainly, have I meditated writing this new Grammar of the Tamul Language, under the presumption that I know more than others. But a certain Personage, both connected with me by old acquaintance, and conspicuous to all by his singular worth, so urged this work by his requests, that observant whether of may love or my respect, I thought I could no longer refuse what was solicited with so much anxious earnestness by such a man. Especially since the mere desires of men of this note, although they come in the guise of intreaty, are, in fact, commands, which it is unlawful for an ingenuous mind to pass by.

In this region there are two dialects of the Tamul Language: I would call one the *High*, the other the *Common*. Some not very correctly call that which differs from *the Common*, *the Poetical* dialect. But since we see the Tamulians use that dialect, not so much in those writings which have the trammels of metre, as in all others which by the old authors skilled in this tongue are composed in prose also, which is especially to be seen in the commentaries of the poets, that dialect will be better named the *more elegant*, or *high*, than the *poetic*. The Tamulians however call this *high dialect* செந்தமிழ், and the *Common* கொடுந்தமிழ்: as if they would call that the *elegant* Tamil dialect, this the *rough*. As I intend hereafter by God's grace to publish a Grammar and Lexicon of the *high* dialect of the language, I shall here treat only of the *rough* or *Common* idiom of the Tamul Language.

But since I ought to instruct you, Religious Candidates of this language, not such of you only as are youths, but you too who are masters of the higher faculties; that going forth in this very discipline as Masters instead of learners, having finished the study of this Grammar, you may be able to teach others; I shall add, to the several modes of speaking, the root from which they are wont to sprout; whence you may at once be able to drink purer water from the fountain, and yourselves to search out similar things. And, certainly, those things of which we can give no reason, although we arrive at them by experience, we can by no means boast that we know: nay, even the parrot can falsely boast that it knows many things.

I shall mention some things which will seem to differ from the old Grammar: others which will appear to contradict

it. I shall not however judge others, being about myself to be judged of all. But since I have paid some attention to the more elegant dialect, from which, as from a fountain, we know the common to flow, I have learnt many things which in the course of time have become corrupted in the common dialect and which are justly condemned even by those Natives who are not altogether unpolished.

This Grammar is divided into Five Chapters,

The First will give the Tamul Letters and Rules of Orthography.

The Second will explain the Nouns and Pronouns.

The Third will treat of the Verbs.

The Fourth will give certain Rules of Syntax.

The Last will give the Numbers and certain other things necessary for beginners.

I shall howevet omit many things which I have not judged to be so necessary, lest, as if desiring to make a floutish of unseasonable erudition, with the acaumulated mass, I might seem either purposely to frighten away those who are anew approaching the wondrous spectre, or to weigh down the still tender shoulders by too great a weight. If any one desires anything more, let him not disdain to consult the Grammar of the more elegant dialect, which, shortly, we shall publish. Moreover of the very Rules which I shall here give, many are not to be proposed to learners at first, which I have explained in their proper places following them in order. It will be for the prudence of teachers to determine for each the mode and time in which it may be fit to read them.

Nor will I detain you longer, most Religious fathers, who performing this embassy for Christ, soon to become Preachers of the Gentiles, have by his counsel become converted to the simplicity of children; and with admirable zeal, though wont elsewhere to instruct others in the sublimest matters, have here begun to lisp the barbarous sounds, which, you have modestly not disdained to learn from others. To this your Apostolic desire, this little work of mine, such as it is, wishes to afford its service. If you are of opinion that you have received and assistance from it, pray ye the common Lord of the harvest, that I also, following your example, may not sit down in slothful idleness in His vineyard-Farewell.

From the Mission of Madura,
29th January, 1728.

A GRAMMAR OF THE TAMUL LANGUAGE.



CHAPTER I.

OF THE TAMUL LETTERS.

SECTION I.

Of the Number and Form of the Letters.

1. The Tamulians reckon thirty letters, which they call எழுத்து: of these twelve are vowels, eighteen consonants. The former they call உயிர், *uir*, the latter மெய், *mey*: as if they should say *soul* and *body*: nor altogether absurdly: for a consonant without a vowel is body without soul: hence also they call a consonant to which no vowel is joined செத்தெழுத்து, that is, a *dead letter*. Of the twelve vowels five are short, and are called குற்றெழுத்து; viz: அ, *a*, இ, *i*, உ, *u*, எ, *e*, ஒ, *o*, Five are long and are called நெட்டெழுத்து, viz: ஆ, ā ஈ, ī, ஊ, ū, ஏ, ē, ஓ, ō, The two others which the Tamulians reckon among the long vowels are in fact dipthongs; viz., ஐ, *ai*. and ஔ, *au*. These twelve vowels I here arrange In the Tamul order, அ, ஆ, இ, ஈ, உ, ஊ, எ, ஏ, ஐ, ஒ, ஓ, ஔ.

2. The eighteen consonants also disposed in the Tamul order are these: க, ங, ச, ஞ, ட, ண, த, ந, ப, ம, ய, ர, ல, வ, ழ, ள, ற, ன. I will give the power of each letter below.

From these letters they form others, which may more truly be called syllables than letters, since they are forms in which vowels are joined to a consonant. For the Tamulians do not. after the excellent plan of Europeans place the vowel after the consonant to form syllables; but of the consonant and vowel united they form a third figure. And as they have called the vowel the soul, and the consonant the body, they accordingly call these syllables உயிர்மெய், as if they should say an *animated body*. But the above mentioned figures of vowels they use only at the beginning of a sentence. Since however the twelve vowels may be joined to every consonant, if you except ங, from every consonant arise twelve figures, which I shall here represent.

3. And 1. To express â short, they add nothing to the consonant, and the same figure, viz., க, expresses both the simple consonant *c*, and the syllable *ca*; and so of the rest; which certainly cannot be approved, and will give no light trouble to beginners.

2. To express ā long they add the figure ா. Thus கா, **cā**; தா, **tā**; பா, & c. Except ணா, னா, றா, to which in order to express ā long they do not add ா, as to the others, but they change the figure in this way ணா, னா, றா. Yet since the said figure ா, may also be the letter *ra* it is liable to become equivocal; thus தாம், may be read ***tam, he, himself***, a term of honor; or it may be read ***taram***, which is taken for turn, (pro vice). Wherefore some

to distinguish them, write ா, when the figure expresses ā long; but when it is to be taken for *ra*, they after the Grandonic (*Sanscrit*) fashion, slightly bend up the anterior stroke and write ர. But in their Grammar called நன்னூல், as well to distinguish ā long from the letter *ra*, as the simple consonant from the consonant joined with â short, they teach certain marks to be written over them, which they call புள்ளி ; thus when the letter is the simple consonant they say this sign ° is to be inscribed; *e. g.* if you write அற்தம், it must not be read *arradam* as would be the case were that mark not there, but it is read, *artam, signification*. As regards the second aequivocation, if this figure ா, is to signify ā long, nothing will be superscribed; but if it is to express the short syllable *rā*, the mark is to be superscribed; *e. g.* the word தாம் without any mark you may read *tam*; with this mark தரம் you may read *taram*. Therefore this word பலா may be read *palā*, and then is not marked and signifies a certain tree; it may also be read *paler, more (in number)*, and then is marked thus, பலர். So மலா, if it be written மலர், is read *maler, flowers*; if it be written மலர, it is read *malera* and is the infinitive of the verb மலருகிறது, *to blossom*. In the same way when the figure expressing ê short and ē long, and ô short and ō long, is the same, for the sake of distinction they direct that mark ‾ to be superscribed over the short letters, the long being left unmarked. Thus மெய் is read *mēy* long, since ெ is unmarked, and means *feed*

thou; but மெய் is read *mĕy* short, and means *truth*. So போய், without a mark, is read *pōy*, long, and means *in going*; but பொய் is read *pôy*, short, and means *a falsehood*. Nevertheless, excepting in some few expressions, I have no where seen these marks superscribed; which certainly would be very useful, especially to beginners, on omission arising perhaps from the laziness of transcribers. I also stat that I have devised another and easier way of distinguishing ē and ō long from ĕ and ŏ short: viz., when the letter ெ called *combu* serves for both, if this is written in its simple form it will be ĕ short and ŏ short: but if it be turned in into the upper part, as I shall mention below of i long, in this way ே, it will be ē and ō long. Thus மெய் *mĕy* short; but மேய் *mēy* long. So பொய், *pôy* short: but போய் *pōy* long. which plan has been approved by many persons who have not disdained to follow it.

3. In the place of i short they add to all letters this figure ி. Thus கி, தி, பி, வி, &c. But to the letter ட they either add the same mark, and write டி, which is more elegant, or they write டி.

4. They express ī long by inflecting the above mentioned mark; thus கீ, தீ, பீ ,வீ, &c.

5. They express both ē and ĕ short by placing before each letter this figure ெ which they call கொம்பு: as தெ, மெ, நெ, &c.

6. O short and long they express by placing the same ெ before the figure which they use for ā long, and they write கொ, லொ, ஞொ, ஙொ, &c.

7. For the diphthong *au* they place ெ before each letter, and ள after; thus கௌ, *cau,* தௌ, *tau,* & c. But it might be read also *kēl, hear;* and *tēl, a scorpion;* wherefore this way of writing is seldom used; but in the place of the diphthong they write â short and add the consonant *v*. Thus the noun *cauvei* they seldom or never write கௌவை, but கவ்வை.

8. To express the diphthong *ai,* they place before each letter the figure ை which they call சுழி. Thus கை, *cai the hand;* தை *tai,* the month *January;* மை, *mai, ink,* & c, Except ண, ன, ல, ள, in which they join a particular figure to the beginning of the letter, and write ணை, னை, லை, ளை, In the expression of *u* long and short they vary much: all the figures however of this letter may be reduced to three 1) From க is made கு, *cu;* கூ *cū;* from ட, டு, டூ; from ம, மு, மூ; from ழ, ழு, ழூ; from ள, ளு, ளூ; from ர, ரு, ரூ.

2) From ச, சு, சூ; from ப, பு, பூ; from ய, யு, யூ; from வ, வு, வூ.

3) From ஞ, ஞு, ஞூ; from ண, ணு, ணூ; from த, து, தூ from ந, நு, நூ; from ல, லு, லூ; from ற, று, றூ; from ன, னு, னூ. To place at once however before the eye what I have set forth thus separately, I will here adduce in the Tamul order the figures of all the characters, the power of which I will explain afterwards.

a	â	i	î	u	û	e	ē	ai	o	ô	au	Final Consonant	
அ	ஆ	இ	ஈ	உ	ஊ	எ	ஏ	ஐ	ஒ	ஓ	ஔ	ஃ	Sound.
க	கா	கி	கீ	கு	கூ	கெ	கே	கை	கொ	கோ	கௌ	க்	k
ங	ஙா	ஙி	ஙீ	ஙு	ஙூ	ஙெ	ஙே	ஙை	ஙொ	ஙோ	ஙௌ	ங்	ng
ச	சா	சி	சீ	சு	சூ	செ	சே	சை	சொ	சோ	சௌ	ச்	s
ஞ	ஞா	ஞி	ஞீ	ஞு	ஞூ	ஞெ	ஞே	ஞை	ஞொ	ஞோ	ஞௌ	ஞ்	nj
ட	டா	டி	டீ	டு	டூ	டெ	டே	டை	டொ	டோ	டௌ	ட்	d palatine.
ண	ணா	ணி	ணீ	ணு	ணூ	ணெ	ணே	ணை	ணொ	ணோ	ணௌ	ண்	n palatine.
த	தா	தி	தீ	து	தூ	தெ	தே	தை	தொ	தோ	தௌ	த்	t
ந	நா	நி	நீ	நு	நூ	நெ	நே	நை	நொ	நோ	நௌ	ந்	n
ப	பா	பி	பீ	பு	பூ	பெ	பே	பை	பொ	போ	பௌ	ப்	p
ம	மா	மி	மீ	மு	மூ	மெ	மே	மை	மொ	மோ	மௌ	ம்	m
ய	யா	யி	யீ	யு	யூ	யெ	யே	யை	யொ	யோ	யௌ	ய்	y
ர	ரா	ரி	ரீ	ரு	ரூ	ரெ	ரே	ரை	ரொ	ரோ	ரௌ	ர்	r
ல	லா	லி	லீ	லு	லூ	லெ	லே	லை	லொ	லோ	லௌ	ல்	l
வ	வா	வி	வீ	வு	வூ	வெ	வே	வை	வொ	வோ	வௌ	வ்	v
ழ	ழா	ழி	ழீ	ழு	ழூ	ழெ	ழே	ழை	ழொ	ழோ	ழௌ	ழ்	l guttural.
ள	ளா	ளி	ளீ	ளு	ளூ	ளெ	ளே	ளை	ளொ	ளோ	ளௌ	ள்	l palatine.
ற	றா	றி	றீ	று	றூ	றெ	றே	றை	றொ	றோ	றௌ	ற்	rr
ன	னா	னி	னீ	னு	னூ	னெ	னே	னை	னொ	னோ	னௌ	ன்	n

SECTION II.

Of the Power of the Letters.

4. To learn the power of the letters of any language from a written body of rules is a long and difficult way of doing it; but it is an easy and short one to hear them from the mouth of a teacher, and to repeat them after him, though it be in a stammering manner. For here surely if anywhere that saying is true; *errando discitur.* However that nothing may be wanting to make my work complete, I shall slightly touch upon, rather than explain, the power of the Letters of the Tamul language.

க, in the beginning of a word is equivalent to our *k*; but in the *middle,* if it be single, it has the force of *g*; if doubled, of *k*: thus காகம் is pronounced c*ā*gam, *a crow*; and காக்கை is pronounced c*ā*kei, another name of a crow.

ங, Many have labored hard to express and discern the power of this letter; and certainly they lose their cost and pains. Let it suffice to know this only, that this letter comes only, at least in the vulgar dialect, before the letter க, and has the sound of the letter *n* before *g*, as in the word *longum*; which if written in Tamul characters would be written லொங்கும்.

ச, at the beginning of a word, and in the middle, if single, generally has the power of the letter *s*; thus சசி is pronounced, *susi, soft*: but if you find it doubled, it is to be pronounced as *cha* by the Portuguese: thus அச்சம் is pronounced *acham, fear.*

ஞ, has the same power as the letters *nh* with the Portuguese *n* with the Spaniards, or *gn* with the French and Italians. It is generally written before ச and then is pronounced as *n* and *g* in the word *angel*: thus அஞ்சினேன் is to be pronounced *anginēn, I have feared,* & c.

த, at the beginning of a word, and in the middle when it is there doubled, sounds like *t*; but when it is only single in the middle of a word, it is equivalent to our *d*: thus துதித்தான் is read *tuditān, he praised.*

ந, has the force of the letter *n*; it is used in the beginning of a word, and before த which then is pronounced as *d*: thus அந்தம் is read *andam, end, perfection.*

ப, at the beginning of a word, and in the middle if double, has the force of the letter *p*: but in the middle if not doubled is the same as *b*: thus பகைப்பான் is read *pagueipān*, and சபை, *sabei.*

ம, in the same as *m*.

ய, is the consonant *y*.

ர, is *r*.

ல, is *l*.

வ, is the consonant *v*.

ற, if single is equivalent to two *rr*: thus திறம் is read *tirram, force*; but if doubled is equivalent to two *tt*: thus குற்றம் is read *cuttam, a fault*: if it occurs after the consonant ன it is pronounced as *d* very soft: as என்று, நன்றி, & c.

ன, is *n*, which however never occurs by itself, as ந, at the beginning of a word, but only in the middle or at the end, as சொன்னேன்.

There still remain four letters, which differ considerably from ours, and are not easily pronounced by foreigners. For instance ட; this when single is pronounced in this way: the tongue having being turned back as far as possible, so as to touch the highest part of the interior of the palate is impelled forward with some force, pronouncing between *da* and *ra*. If however it be found doubled, ட்ட, the tongue beging turned back and made to vibrate with force in the same way, *ta* is pronounced. If it be single, but a consonant before another consonant, as in this word, நட்பு, it is pronounced, in the same way, as the consonant *t*. They say that the English have a letter which is pronounced in the same way and with the same sound.

ண, this will be pronounced as *n*, the tongue being turned back in the same way: whence it well agrees with ட; nor is any other consonant *n* besides this ever written before this letter.

ள, is a kind of *l*, which is pronounced by a very slight reflexion of the tongue as far as the middle of the palate.

ழ, is also another *l* which is pronounced with a thicker sound, the tongue being turned back altogether to the

hinder part of the palate. And I shall say no more of the power of the Letters, since their sound must be acquired not from writings but from the voice.

5. When I had written these few observations on the subject of pronounciation, a certain person requested that I would add something about the sound by which the Tamulians distinguish long from short syllables, forasmuch as it is peculiar, and difficult to foreigners. For if a word be a polysyllable in the Latin tongue, we do not by sound distinguish the long from the short syllables, except the penultimate: and in the vernacular languages of Europe, excepting the French, we do not mark them, excepting the last syllable: but the Tamulians properly distinguish them by the sound in every word. But on the subject of sound, it is as difficult to write as easy to speak. A certain Poet, praising painting, called it the art by which we paint words, and speak to the eyes: this he said, poetically rather than truly; for a picture expresses indeed our idea, but not our words. Nor would I say that painting differs much from writing, except that it is a book which is read even by the ignorant, and is drained, at one glance, and devoured, as it were, by the eyes. But we call writing, *dead language,* since it utters words without sound. We know what Cicero *wrote:* many, with reason, doubt with *what sound* he *pronounced* what he has written. Wherefore the sound of words is to be imparted not by rules to readers, but

by voice to listeners. Nevertheless that I may indulge, rather than satisfy, the desire of those who have no opportunity of hearing persons speak as the Tamulians do, I will add briefly a few observations.

6. The Tamulians assign a *measure* of time, which they call மாத்திரை, and by it they measure the sound of every letter, giving a double *measure* to a long syllable, a single one to a short syllable, and half a *measure* to a consonant. According to this rule they pronounce every syllable, and well express the long and the short ones in every word even though it may consist of 4 or 5 or 6 syllables: thus when they pronounce this word of 6 syllables, பாத்திரத்திேனோடே, *pāttirattinode,* (which is the ablative from the noun பாத்திரம், *a vessel or pot*), it is well understood, that the *first*, the *penultimate* and the *last* syllables are long: but that the *third,* although from a double consonant it would be equivalent in verse to a long syllable, is nevertheless naturally short. And this word is well distinguished from another பத்திரத்திேனோடே, *pattirattinode,* (the ablative of the noun பத்திரம், *caution*); although this word differs from the first in this only, that the first syllable of the last word is naturally short, although it becomes long in metre from the double consonant. This certainly is usually difficult to beginners: and yet it is so necessary to be attended to in this language, that by this one neglect in particular, we never can explain our meaning, and when we try to say one thing, the natives understand the direct

contrary. Thus should you say கெட்டேன் and pronounce the first syllable long, it will imply *I have sought*, or *I have heard*; should you pronounce the same short, it will mean, *I have perished*: and a hundred others in this way.

7. Wherefore 1. Whenever we meet with a long letter we must dwell on its pronounciation the double measure of time; almost as the French pronounce the word *ètrange*: in which word of three syllables, although the penultimate may be pronounced as long, yet we well know that the first is pronounced long, and it differs from the word *revanche*, in which the first syllable is pronounced short. In the same way ஆனந்தம் and அனந்தம் differ from each other.

2. When a letter is naturally short, but two consonants follow it, it is generally pronounced as this word, *avancè*, with the French; in which the second *a* before two consonants is expressed as short, and is distinguished from this *j' avance*, where that *a* is pronounced as long. So is pronounced மறந்தேன்; where the second *a*, since it is short, although it be followed by two consonants, is pronounced as short, and is equivalent to the said word *avancè*.

3. A greater difficulty is when the word is of two syllables: then, if each syllable is long, it is pronounced as this word by the French ā*gè*: thus மாசே, மாதா, & c. If

the second only be long, it is pronounced as if it had the accent only at the end, as *pelè*: thus பலா, பிதா, & c. And here even, if two consonants intervene, as இன்றே, அன்றோ, & c., it is pronounced as *tombè* in French. But if the first only is long, then it is pronounced as in French the noun *bâton*, and the verb *mélons*: but if both be short, it is pronounced as in French the noun *melon*, and the verb *batons*. I will add also, with reference to this last point, an example from the Latin tongue, for the use of those who may be unacquainted with French. These two nouns of two syllables காதம், *cādam*, a tamul *league*, (which equals three French leagues), and கதம் *cadam*, *anger*, differ in this one thing; that the first has the first syllable long, but the second has both short. Of these, the word காதம், which has the first syllable long, is pronounced as in Latin the word *cadam*, from the verb *cado:* கதம் however, with its two short syllables, in pronounced with altogether the same sound with which the same *cadam* would be pronounced in Latin if compounded, as *decadam* from *decado*. For, if any one will pay a little attention, he will see how much the sound with which *cadam*, by itself, is uttered, differs from the sound which it has in the word *decadam*: there is the same difference between காதம் and கதம் in Tamul. And these may suffice, that I waste no longer time, as if I would change the objects of the senses, and teach the eyes sound.

SECTION III

Of the Variations in Pronunciation.

8. Sometimes, the *form* of a letter being unchanged, the *sound* of the same is varied: for which the Rules are these.

Rule 1. *A, short,* at the end of the word which is polysyllable, and which, after the *a*, has for its last letter one of these six consonants, ல், ழ், ள், ர், ன், ண், then the *a* is pronounced with so gentle a sound, that it seems *e* soft. Thus பகல் is not pronounced *pagal* but *paguel, a day:* in the same way புகழ் is sounded *puguel, praise;* அவள் *avel, she;* சுவர் *suver, a wall;* அவன் *aven, he;* அரண் *aren, a citadel,* & c. Hence although before க, த, ச, the letter ம் may be changed into *n*, when this is not ன், but ங் or ந் or ஞ்: then if *a* precedes it is not changed in sound, and still the *a* is clearly expressed, and the difference appears, *e. g.* between this word பலன், *a reward,* and this பலம் *a kind of weight.* Also when ம் final is changed into *n*; for பலங்கொடு, is called *palan codu;* பலந்தா, *palandā;* பலஞ்சிறிது *palan sirridu;* and it is never pronounced *palen,* as this, பலன், always is, when it has ன் at the end.

Observe that although in declining these nouns, more letters are added, whereby the word may not any longer end in *a* and one of the said six consonants, still the *a* is always pronounced as *e* soft. Thus பகலுக்கு, பகலை, & c. is not called *pagaluca,* or *pagalei,* but *paguelucu,*

paguelei, & c., if, as I said at the beginning, the word be a polysyllable. For if it be a monosyllable, as நல், கல், பல், கள், தன், கண், & c. it is not called *nel, quel*, & c. but, the sound not being changed, it is called *nal, cal, pal, cal, tan, can*, & c.

9. Rule 2. The Diphthong *ai* in a polysyllable, in whatever syllable excepting the first, is pronounced generally as *ei*, with a gentle sound, as we have said above when speaking of *a*; so that even in a verse, although it be a diphthong, it may be taken in that case as short, and is called ஐகாரக் குறுக்கம், *the abbreviation of the letter ai*. Thus உடைமை is not read *udaimai but udeimei*; changing the sound of that ை which is in the middle and in the end of that word. But in this word கைமையை, *a widow*, the ை at the beginning does not change the sound, but only in the middle and at the end, and it is pronounced *caimeiei*. In the same way when the word is a monosyllable, the sound never diminishes; whence கை *the hand*, மை *ink*, தை, *the month January*, & c. are called respectively *cai, mai, tai* & c.

10. Rule 3. I short, before ற is generally pronounced so softly, that it seems not to exist. Thus at the end of verbs, க்கிறது or கிறது are pronounced as if they were *cradu* or *gradu* : thus பிறகாசம், *pragasam*, சீக்கிறம், *sicram*, & c. And this to such a degree, that even in verse, when it is necessary, the *i* need not be counted. Moreover *i*, long or short, before ழ, is pronounced generally as *u*: thus தமிழ், *tamul*; பிழவை, *pulavei;* பீழை, *pūlei*, & c. Also *i* long before ட, is pronounced as if it were *u:* thus வீடு, *wūdu;* பீடம் *pūdam*, & c.

SECTION IV.

Of the Variations in the forms of the Letters.

11. The Tamulians not only do not distinguish their sentences by any stops, but they do not, either, separate the words from one another; but even to the end of every period they write all so united together, that the whole seems but one word: and a Tamul period may be called, not so much, a necklace of orderly strung pearls, as a chain of rings joined together in ignoble captivity. Hence the Tamulians never use the forms of vowels, which I adduced at the beginning of this work, unless the period begins with a word which has a vowel at the beginning of it. But in the middle of a sentence.

1. If after a word ending in a consonant, another follows beginning with a vowel, they change the form of the final consonant and connect with it the form of the following vowel. Thus they do not write இவன்—இல்லை, but as if it were one word இவனில்லை; which certainly will occasion trouble to a beginner; for unless he first break up this connection, and regard each word as liberated from it, he can neither understand them himself, nor will he ever be able to find them in any Lexicon.

2. The consonant ம before க becomes ங; before ச it becomes ஞ; and before த it becomes ந. Thus ம at the end of this word செயம், *victory*, is changed thus: செயங் கொண்டேன், செயஞ் சொன்னேன், செயந் தந்தேன், *I have led, I have spoken, I have given,* & c. victory.

3. The consonant ல, before க, ச, த, ப, is very frequently changed into ற; and if த follows, this also is changed into ற. Thus, to show all these in one sentence, instead of writing, விடாமல்ச் செய்த தவத்திநால்த் தப்பாமல்க் கதியில்ப் பலநுகும், they write better விடாமற் செய்த தவத்திநூற்றப்பாமற் கதியிற் பலநுகும், *to constant penitence there will be a sure reward in heaven.* So, in the same way, the consonant ள, before க, ச, த, ப, is changed sometimes into ட: and if த follows this also is changed into ட. Thus instead of saying நாள்த்தோறும், *day by day*, they say நாட்டோறும், or even, omitting one ட, it is more elegantly expressed நாடோறும். So இந் நாட்பயிர், *corn fields of this time;* பல நாட்செய்தி, *ancient history;* திரு நாட்கடன், *the obligation of a feast day*, & c.

4. If after the final consonants ண், ன், a word follows which begins with த, it ought always to be changed after ண் into ட, and after ன் into ற. Thus கண் திறந்தான் ought to be written கண்டிறந்தான்: so பலன் தந்தான், must be written பலன் றந்தான், & c. But we scarcely use this rule in the vulgar dialect, although it is inviolable in the high dialect; since however we may sometimes use it, I have been willing to give it, that beginners may recognise the root of some nouns which are compounded according to this rule. Thus from மண், *the earth*, and தலம், *a piece*, arises மண்டலம், & c. Moreover, if a word which ends in ண் or ன், has the form of the nominative, but the signification and force of an oblique case, as often happens in this language; a-

அவன் கை instead of saying அவனுடைய கை: then if there follows a noun beginning with க, ச, த, ப, the ண also is well altered into ட; and ன into ற; and the த following into ட or ற. Thus, since instead of saying மண்ணாற்செய்த பாத்திரம், *a vessel made of clay,* it is well to say மண் பாத்திரம்: then it is better written மட்பாத்திரம். So பொன்னாற் செய்த கம்பி, தகடு, சிலை, பாத்திரம், thread made of gold, *a thin plate of metal, a statue, a vase;* is more elegantly expressed பொற்கம்பி, பொற்றகடு, பொற்சிலை, பொற்பாத்திரம், & c.

12. Besides these, I shall in my Grammar of the high dialect, explain many other rules of variation, which would be over-burdensome to beginners. Here it may suffice finally to observe that the letter ர *r,* is never either lost or changed: whence arises their mistake, who, from the verb தீருகிறது for example, form the praeterite தீந்தேன், when it ought to be தீர்ந்தேன், & c. They are wrong also, who, when two க follow after *r,* deem it the same to write ர்க்க or ற்க. Thus from போற் a *fight,* arises போர்க்களம், *a field of battle*: more however write போற்க்களம், which cannot be allowed to be right, and means another thing: and the first is pronounced *porcalam,* but the second *potcalam.* So instead of writing மனுஷர்க்கு, *to men,* many erroneously conclude it may be written also மனுஷற்கு: but this is the dative singular from மனுஷன்; while that is the plural from மனுஷர்; the first is pronounced *manuxercu,* the second *manuxetcu*: all which differ greatly. Moreover in the same way, when

the letter ற follows the consonant ண, some decide that it may be written, indifferently, either as these two letters, ன்ற, or as a double letter, ண. And the Tamul Portuguese Lexicon expressly has this, teaching for example that கன்று may be written கண்ணு, & c. But how untruly this is stated, may appear from this very thing, that கன்றுக்கு signifies, *to a calf,* in the dative; and கண்ணுக்கு means, *to the eye.* Thus என்றைக்கு is the dative from the word என்று, *when?* and எண்ணெய்க்கு is the dative from the word எண்ணெய் *oil.* So மன்றுடுகிறது is, *to ask,* and மண்ணுடுகிறது s, *to make the earth to quake;* and so six hundred others. whence in truth it is by no means allowable to write or pronounce either ன்ற or ண indifferently: and certainly I have never even once, either seen them written, or heard them pronounced, indifferently, by natives skilled in the language; and no one will praise us for blindly following the ignorant.

SECTION V.

Of the Addition of Letters.

13. The Tamulians in the course of speaking often add letters, which it is highly expedient to know, not only for the perfection of pronunciation and othography, but also for the understanding what is read. For if any one ignorant of this Rule should see written, for example, the word இந்தவாசை, he may know the இந்த to be the article *this*, but he will know nothing of வாசை, nor will he find it by searching. But from the Rules which we here give, he will know, that the consonant *v* here is added, which being taken away, he will read ஆசை, and at once will know it to mean *desire*. Wherefore

1. That they may entirely avoid a concourse of vowels, if after the final vowel of one word, another vowe, follows, as in the example now adduced இந்த—ஆசை; then if the final vowel of the former word be *u* short, it is left out, and in place of that *u*, there is added to the consonant which remains. the vowel by which the following word begins. Thus வந்து இருக்கிறன், the *n* being taken away and *i* annexed, what was *du* becomes *di* and is written வந்திருக்கிறன். Except words which have two syllables, both short, and no double consonant between them: for these never lose the *u*, but follow the Rule following.

14. 2. If after other final vowels, which are not *u* (when this is struck out according to the Rule just given.)

another vowel follows, those are not struck out; but between these two vowels, final and initial, there is added either ய or வ ; and with these is conjoined the vowel with which the following word begins ; for which this Rule is to be observed. No account being made of the vowel which follows, that which precedes is to be considered ; and if this be *a*, ā, *u*, ū, *o*, ō, or *au*, வ is always added. Thus அல்ல — என்றான், *he said not*, is written அல்லவென்றான். So அவைகேறுவென்றால் : so பூவொடுத்தான், & c So when according to the Rule given above குரு, நடு, பொது, & c. do not strike out the *u*, we must write குருவிருக்கிறான், நடுவில்லை, பொதுவோலை, & c. by adding வ. Of these இது, அது, either retain or lose *u* at pleasure : if they retain it, வ must be added. So இதாங்காரம், of இதுவாங்காரம், & c. But if the preceding vowel be i ī, *e* ē, or *ai* then ய is added. Thus they say தம்பியழை நீயிங்கேயிரு, கையையோங்கு, & c. This Rule is so universal, that whatever we find written in opposition to this arrangement is to be condemned as an error: in which arrangement, we often and often observe, that even those natives who are not skilful make mistakes, by writing generally ய, where வ ought to be added.

15. 3. If after final consonant there follows a vowel, then if the preceding word be a monosyllable short, the last consonant is doubled : *e.g.* கண், என், தன், மெய், & c. If the word ஆசை follows, it is written கண்ணாசை, என்னாசை, தன்னாசை, மெய்யாசை, & c. But if that monosyllable is long, the last consonant is not doubled : thus போய், if

it is the gerund from the verb போறது, is long; whence without doubling the ய, it must be written போயி : but if it be the noun which means *a falsehood*, then it is short, it ought to be written with a double ய, பொய்யிருக்கும், & c

16. 4. If after a final vowel, there follows a consonant there is no change made ; unless the following consonant is one of these க, ச, த, ப ; for these are very often doubled. But it is so difficult to explain when they ought to be doubled, and when not, that all that should be said cannot be perfectly contained in rules : still I shall here copiously give many rules, which I have learnt by long experience and accurate study. Nor let any, accusing me of pursuing levitics, or wasting time in trifles, despise these rules ; nor, as if they would receive no remuneration for their labor, let them fear a loss of the time expended in reading these rules, which the rich fruits of them can abundantly compensate : especially, since, from this very thing, the meaning of a sentence may be greatly altered. Thus *e. g.* if you write, கன்னி தாய், it means *a virgin's mother*; but if you write கன்னித்தாய், it means, *a mother. who is a virgin*: and so infinitely. Hence, very often, the natives will not understand our meaning, though we pronounce words thoroughly tamul, with tamul phrase and tamul sound also; from this one circumstance; because we either double what ought to be single, or contrariwise. Wherefore, although as we have said, everything cannot be contained in Rules, I will here adduce some, which are both more universal and more easy.

17. And let Rule I be: As often as a word precedes, which, its last consonant being doubled, has *u* at the end, க, ச, த, ப if they follow, are always doubled. Thus கடுப்புக் கடிது, அச்சுச் சிறிது, புல்லுத் தனது, நெருப்புப் பெரிது, &c. This Rule is wholly universal without exception; nor know I have another could write, that these letters are not doubled, if after nouns which end in a double consonant with *u*, there follows, not another noun, but a verb; and he adds as an example கூற்று பார்த்தான், பல்லு தேய்ச்சான். Still this is totally untrue, with his own examples; forasmuch as even when a verb follows, those letters must be doubled, and we must say, கூற்றுப் பார்த்தான், பல்லுத் தேய்ச்சான். So மட்டுக் கடந்தான், நெல்லுச் சுமந்தான், இக்கட்டுத் தீர்த்தான், கட்டுப் பிரித்தான், பல்லுக் கடித்தான் வில்லுத் தொடுத்தான்: and thus of all others. Hence, by this, Rule, those letters are always doubled after the dative, which always ends in *u* with a double க. Thus அவனுக்குச் சொன்னான், எனக்குத் தந்தான், &c. So by this same Rule, if the gerund end in *u* with the same double consonant, it doubles those letters; thus பெற்றுப் போனான், படித்துக் கொண்டான், அழைத்துத் தந்தான், பட்டுச் செத்தான், &c. But not if the gerund in *u* dose not double the consonant at the end; thus it is said, நின்று சொன்னான், வந்து தந்தான், கொண்டு போனான். This universal Rule is followed also by those nouns, which do not in fact double their last consonant, but yet terminate in two consonants of that kind which the Tamulians call வல்லினம், which are க, ச, ட, த, ப, ற, of which one may be consonant, the other may have *u*;

e. g. கற்பு, நட்பு, உட்கு, அவற்கு, &c. for these always double the following letter: கற்புக் காத்தான், நட்புக் கொண்டான், உட்குத் தீர்ந்தான், அவற்குச் சொன்னான், &c. And the reason is, because in these cases, those letters are pronounced as if they were doubled: for we do not say *catbu, natbu, utgu, avetgu;* but *catpu, natpu, utcu, avetcu* &c. Finally, I have said above, if at the end of a word, *u,* occur with a double consonant: for if after the same double consonant another vowel follows, it would not, by this rule, double the following letter. Thus it is said, எல்லை கடந்தான், மட்டை சீவினான், புத்தி சொன்னான், செட்டி போனான், கத்தி தேய்த்தான், &c. the following letter not being doubled.

18. Rule 2. After the Accusative, without any exception, those letters are always doubled: Thus அதைக் கண்டான், அதைச் செய்தான், அதைத் தந்தான், அதைப் பிடித்தான், &c

19. Rule 3. After an Ablative ending in ல், if *e* final is not annexed, as may be done, those letters if they follow are always doubled: thus வனத்தில்த் திரிந்தான், வீட்டில்க் கிடந்தான், மனதில்ச் சலித்தான், படையில்ப் பட்டான், &c. In the same way after another Ablative which ends in ஆல்: thus அவனால்க் கெட்டான், அவனால்ச் செத்தான், அவனால்த் தேறினான், அவனால்ப் பிழைத்தான், &c. But as, in that case, the ல is more elegently changed into ற, then those letters are not doubled: thus, வீட்டிற் கிடந்தான், அவனாற் கெட்டான், &c. This Rule also under no circum stance admits of exception.

20. Rule 4. The Subjunctive *if*, என்றால், வந்தால், போனால், & c. and all negative gerunds, as இல்லாமல், அல்லாமல், செய்யாமல், பேசாமல், & c. these, I say, all, according to the above Rule, either change ல் into ற், or double those consonants க, ச, த, ப, if they follow. Thus என்னை யல்லாமல்ச் செய்தான், என்னை யல்லாமற் செய்தான். Thus பேசாமற் போனான், or பேசாமல்ப் போனான், & c.

21. Rule 5. After a gerund ending in *i*, they are always doubled: சொல்லிக்கொண்டான், அருளிச் செய்தான், பண்ணித் தந்தான், வெட்கிப் போனான், & c. The Gerunds, போய் and ஆய், that from the verb போறது, this from the verb ஆகிறது, since in fact they ought to end in *i*, போயி, ஆயி, as they are often used in the language of the earned, even though after the removel of the *i* the consonant ய may remain, follow the same Rule, and double the following letter: போய்க் கொடு, சுத்தமாய்ச் சொல்லு, & c.

22. Rule 6. After the Infinitive, which ends in *a*, those letters are always doubled; சொல்லக் கேட்டேன், போகச் சொன்னேன், நிறையத் தந்தேன், செய்யப் போனேன், & c. There is no exception, unless when they use the Infinitive for the Imperative, as we shall describe at Number 69. For then, because that word ends the sense of the sentence, it does not double the letter following. Thus கேள்க்க சுவாமி, *hear O Lord*; வா சீக்கிரம், *come quickly*, & c.

23. Rule 7. After every dissyllabic noun, having both syllables short, with no intermediate consonant, and

ending with *u*: as புது, *new*, பொது *universal*, நடு the *middle*, குரு *a priest*, மறு *a spot*, மரு *a good odour*, திரு *happy*, மது *honey*, & c. After these and words like them those etters are doubled if they follow. whether the word which follows be a noun or a verb. Thus it is said புதுச் சுவாமி, பொதுச்சொல், மறுத் துடைத்தான், குருப் பிடிப்பித் தார், மதுக் குடித்தான், திருப் பாதம், மருக் கொழுந்து, & c. Nevertheless, a custom of saying, குரு சுவாமி, has prevailed. Except the numbers; as ஒரு, இரு, அறு, & c. which do not double the following letter, because they are taken as adjectives: ஒரு குதிரை, இருபது, அறுபது, & c. Thus they say, ஒரு காலம், *one time;* but yet they say ஒருக்காலுமில்லை, *at no time*, & c. Except also, இது, அது, *this*, *that*, which never double the following letter: இது பெரிது, அது சிறிது, & c. Except the adjective சிறு from சிறுமை: thus சிறு கலம், & c. Except finally, those words which to beginners will appear to be nouns, but are in truth participles according to the rules of the more elegent dialect, and therefore do not double the following letter: as, மறு, when it does not signify *a spot*, (for then it is a noun and does double the following letters;) but when it signifies *another*, as மறு நாள், *another day*: fo then it is a word derived from a verb, and does no double those letters. Thus, மறு கறி கொண்டுவா, *bring another dish*; மறு பிழைப்பில்லை, *there is no other way of living.*, & c. Hence, if it is written, மறு சொல், it means, *another word:* if மறுச் சொல், it means *a spotted word*, *i. e.* an *erroneous* word.

24. Rule 8. After இந்த, அந்த, எந்த, those letters are always doubled: இந்தக் கை, அந்தச் செய்தி, எந்தத் தறுவாய், அந்தப் பகை, &c.

25. Rule 9. After certain particles which they themselves call, இடைச் சொல்; இனி, *for the future;* தனி, *alone, without a companion;* போல *just as if;* மற்று *moreover;* மற்ற *the rest;* அன்றி *besides;* இன்றி *without:* இல்லை *not;* அல்ல *no;* &c. Those letters are always doubled after these: இனிச் செய்வோன், தனிப் பயணம், அறிந்தாரைப் போலத் திரி, மற்றக் காரியம், &c.

26. Rule 10. They are always doubled, after nouns ending in a long vowel whether it be ā: நா *the tongue,* பா *a song:* or whether it be ī: ஈ *a fly,* தீ *fire:* or it be ū; பூ *a flower:* or it be ō; கோ *a king:* thus நாக் கசந்தது, பாடாத் தகர்ந்தது, ஈச் செற்றது, தீப் பற்றினது, பூப் பூத்தது, &c. நீ *Thou,* does not double them indeed: but in truth it is not of this Rule: for it ought to be written, not நீ, but நீய், with the consonant ய் at the end. Of this Rule are Negative Participles which end in *ada:* இல்லாத, ஆகாத, &c. They-may throw away the *da,* and be pronounced, இல்லா, ஆகா, &c. and then they double the following letter: இல்லாப் பொய், ஆகாக் காரியம் &c. However when the third person neuter of the negative verb is செய்யாது, வாராது, &c. and even, து being rejected, செய்யா, வாரா, &c. then nevertheless, since it is the verb absolute, and not a participle, those letters, if they follow, are not doubled. Thus, if it should

be said to one awaiting something, *go, that will not come yet*, the expression should be, இப்போதது வாரா போ, and the ப is not doubled: and so of others. Many words, which are of the Grandonic (Sanscrit) language, are excepted, which do not double these letters; thus மகா சந்தோஷம், மகா பிரசாதம், &c.

27. Rule 11. After the names of animals, trees, and all things which are inanimate, if there follows a noun, the name of their parts, so that the principal noun, though it has the form of the nominative, is in signification, to be taken in an oblique case; then க, ச, த, ப, if they follow, are always doubled. Thus, கிளிக் கால்; for it means கிளியின் கால், *the foot of a parrot.* So புலித் தோல், குதிரைத் தலை, யானைக் கொம்பு, பூனைக் கண், குரங்குத் தலை, வண்டுச் சிறகு, பாம்புப் பல், &c. all these from names of animals. So, முருங்கைக்காய், இலந்தைக் காய், அத்திப் பழம், எட்டிப் பழம், முல்லைக் கொடி, நாவல்ப் பழம், or நாவற் பழம், பாகல்க் காய், or பாகற் காய், &c. and these from names of trees. So மலைப் பக்கம், மலைச் சாரல், கடல்க் கரை or கடற் கரை, போர்க் களம், &c. which nouns express things inanimate. But I have said, if the principal noun has the from if the nominative, and in signification is to be taken in an oblique case: for if the principal noun is to be taken in the nominative, it never would double the following letter. Thus it is right to say, கிளிக் காலையறுத்தேன் *I have cut off the parrot's foot;* because the principal noun கிளி, *a parrot,* although it has the form or

the nominative, is here to be taken in an oblique case. But it I would say, *the parrot stretched out its foot,* then because *parrot* is taken in the nominative, I should, without doubling the க, say, கிளி காலை நீட்டிற்று. In the same way, I may say, அத்திப்பழங் கண்டேன், *I have seen the fruit of the tree called atti*: but the ப not being doubled, I should say, அத்திப்பழந் தந்தது, *the tree called atti has yielded fruit.* So I may say, கடல்க்கரை கண்டேன், *I have seen the shores of the Sea*; but the க not being doubled, we may say, கடல் கரை கடந்து *the Sea has passed beyond its shore*: and so of others. But the names of men do not follow this Rule, and never in like circumstance double the following letter. Thus it is said தம்பி கை, தங்கை தலை, தபசி சரீரம், & c. From the General Rule however except some names of trees, which vary: for some add *am*; thus from புளி, ஒதி, ஆல், comes புளிய மரம், புளியங் காய், புளியம் பழம், ஒதிய மரம், ஒதியங் கொம்பு, & c. ஆல மரம், ஆலங் காய், ஆலம் பழம், & c. Others change the last syllable into *am*: thus from இலவு comes இலவசம் பூ, இலவங் காய், & c. from இலும்பிச்சை comes இலும்பிச்சங் காய், இலும்பிச்சம் பழம், & c. from நாற்தை comes நாற்தம் பூ, நாற்தங் காய், & c. from பனை comes பனங் காய், & c. According to this exception, the name of a certain plant of grain, called கம்பு, has கம்பங் கருது, கம்பந் தட்டை, & c. But the name of the tree, called வேம்பு, has வேப்ப மரம், வேப்பங் காய், வேப்பம் பழம், & c. But the tree called தெங்கு rejecting altogether the last syllable கு, adds காய் and makes தேங்காய்.

28. Rule 12. But if nouns of this kind end in a long they follow Rule 10, Number 26, and double the following letter, whether the principal noun occurs in the nominative or not. Thus they say, பிருக் காலை யறுத்தேன், and பிருக் காலை நீட்டிற்று, *I have cut off the foot of the pigeon*, and, *the pigeon stretched its foot.* So பலாக் காயைத் தின்றேன், கிளாக் காயைத் தின்றேன், *I have eeten the fruit of the tree called Palā and Ōuilā.* And, even although they occur in the nominative, they double, thus, பலாக் காயைத் தந்தது. கிளாக் காயைத் தந்தது, *the tree Palā and Ōuitā has yielded fruit* & c. Except மா and விளா: these two nouns, if they occur in the nominative, double by the general Rule; but if they occur in an oblique case, they add *m.* Thus in the nominative, மாப் பழத்தைத் தந்தது, விளாப் பழத்தைத் தந்தது, *the tree Mā and Vila has yielded fruit:* but in an oblique case, they say, மாம்பழத்தைத் தின்றேன், விளாம்பழத்தைத் தின்றேன், *I have eaten the fruit of the tree Mā and Vila:* so மாங்காய், விளாங்காய், & c.

Rule 13. Except from the above rule, nouns which end in டு, று, து, without a consonant preceding: as ஆடு, மாடு, ஆறு, வயிறு, எருது, & c. For these, if they, occur in an oblique case with another noun, and are used in the manner of adjectives, as in its proper place we shall describe, do double their own last consonant, and the first of the following word, according to the Rule here for the first time given: thus ஆட்டுக் குட்டி; மாட்டுக் கொட்டில், ஆற்றுப் பாச்சல், வயிற்றுக் கடுப்பு, எருதுக் கால்,

& c. Some nouns, even though they have a consonant before the last syllable, reject that, and double the last with the following: thus from மருந்து, *medicine*, comes மருந்துப் பை, *the bag in which the Indians carry medicine*. So from இரும்பு, *iron*, comes இரும்புப் பாலம், *thin layers or plates of iron*, & c. But still from பிரம்பு, *the Indian osier (rattan)*, comes பிரப்பங் கட்டில், *a couch of rattan*.

30. Rule 14. Nouns ending in ம், if they occur in an oblique case, or in the manner if an adjective with another noun, often, rejecting ம add த்து, and double the following letter by Rule 1, Number 17. Thus from வேதம் comes வேதத்துக் காரியம்; from குளம் comes குளத்துத் தண்ணீர்; from முகம் comes முகத்துச் சாயல், & c. Hence if I wish to say, *the shore or margin of a pool*, I might say குளத்துக் கரை, which certainly is not an error: but the custom of saying, குளத்தங்கரை, prevails.

31. Rule 15. When these said letters, க, ச, த, ப, are doubled after nouns which end in ம், and, this being removed, the are joined with another principal noun as adjectives, the matter becomes so doubtful that I will not venture to give a rule for it. For they say, for example, ஞானத்தீர்வை, with double த; and they say ஞானதீட்சை, with the த not doubled: and the reason is generally to be sought from the Grandonic (Sanscrit) Language, where besides *ca* there is *ga*: so *sa* and *cha*, *ta* and *da*, *pa* and *ba*. Hence from the diversity of the initial letter

they are doubled or not; which therefore must be learnt by experience. But it is not true, what another has written; namely, that if there follows a noun beginning with பிற, the ப is always to be doubled: it is not true I say; forasmuch as, although they may say, அமுற்தக்கடல் the க being doubled; yet they say, அமுற்த பிறசங்கம், the ப not being doubled, although it be a noun beginning with பிற. So, they say, சகலபிறகாசம், பிறதான பிறப்பு, &c, the ப not being doubled.

32. I add finally Rule 16, for the verb படுகிறது: for this generally doubles in the first consonant ப, even though nouns precede it which are not wont to double the following letter. Thus, without doubling the ப, they say, ஒரு பட்சி அடி போட்டான், இப்படி போனான், ஆசை பெரிது, நிந்தை பெரிது, &c. But if to these words படுகிறது be annexed, immediately the ப is doubled. Thus they say, ஒருப்பட்ட, அடிப்பட்ட, இப்படிப்பட்ட, ஆசைப்பட்ட நிந்தைப்பட்ட, &c. So பயப்பட, சந்தேகப்பட, &c. See besides what we say at Number 129.

SECTION VI.

Of the Grandoic (Sanscrit) Letters.

33. Since the Tamulians very often use some words and letter borrowed from the Grandonic language, shall here give the Grandonic letters which are in use lamong the Tamulians.

1. ஷ *xa*, ஷா *xā*, ஷி *xi*, ஷீ *xī*.

2. க்ஷ *cxa*, க்ஷா *cxā*, க்ஷி *cxi*, க்ஷீ *exi*. Instead of this letter the Tamulians often write the consonant, ட் and ச: thus, காக்ஷி or காட்சி, இரக்ஷிக்கிறது or இரட்சிக்கிறது.

3. ஷ is pronounced like the consonant *x* before ட doubled, *xta*, ஷி *xti*, ஷீ *xtu*.

4. ஸ is the Sanscrit *s*, which they write above many letters ஸ்த *sta*, ஸ்ந *sna*, & c. They also write ஸ்ம *sma*, ஸ்ப *spa*, ஸ்க *sca*, ஸ்டு *stu*; all from the Sanscrit language,

5. ஶ்ர is *tra*; and if you add ஸ, in this way ஸ்ர it will be *stra*, ஸ்ரீ *stri*, & c.

And these observations on the letters and orthography of the Tamul language may by sufficient. All which, I certainly do not think necessary to be proposed to beginners, at the commencement; although following the order of my subject, I have judged it right to give them here at once,

CHAPTER II

OF THE NOUN AND PRONOUN

SECTION I

Of the Declension of Nouns.

34. From letters and syllables, of which thus far we have treated, are formed words; amongst which, since the Noun claims the chief part in a sentence, it is first to be treated of. The Noun, which to distinguish it from the verb, the Tamulians call பெயர் *peyer,* is not, properly, in this language of more than one declension: for the cases of all Nouns are declined in the same way. They themselves reckon eight cases, which, by a common term, they call வேற்றுமை *Vōttumei, i. e. difference;* and they name them from the form of the termination; *e. g* the accusative, since it ends in *ai,* is called ஐ யென்னும் வேற்றுமை, *the case called ai;* and so of the rest: except however the nominative, which they call பெயர், that is, *the noun;* and the vocative, which they call விளி வேற்றுமை, *i. e. the case of calling,* from the verb விளிக்கிறது, *to call.* They themselves, I say, reckon eight cases: but the two which they add to our cases, may be reduced to the ablative, as I shall explain below.

35. The terminations of the cases are these :

1. The Genitive ends in இன், or இனுடைய, or உடைய. Thus from the noun மலை, *a mountain,* comes மலையின், or மலையினுடைய, or மலையுடைய, In the higher dialect the Tamulians never terminate the Genitive by

the word உடைய, but either by இன் or by அது, or by இனது. Thus மலையின், மலையினது, மலையது. This mode we use sometimes in the ordinary dialect. Thus தனது கை, நமது கை, &c. instead of saying தன்னுடைய கை, நம்முடைய கை, &c. Thus ஆரது இந்தக் குதிரை, *whose is this horse*, &c.

2. The Dative ends in க்கு: thus மலைக்கு

3. The Accusative ends in *ai*: மலையை.

4. The Vocative generally ends in ē: மலையே.

5. They form three Ablatives, as I have stated above. The *Ablative of quiet*, or *of existence* ends in இல், or இடத்தில்; மலையில், or மலையிடத்தில்.

6. *The Ablative of the Instrument* or *cause ends* in ஆல் or இனால்: மலையால், மலையினால்.

7. *The Ablative of Society* and sometimes of *the Instrument* ends in ஓடு or இனோடு: மலையோடு or மணயினோடு.

Observe that to these three Ablatives may be added the letter ē, and be expressed மலையிலே, மலையினாலே, மலையினோடே.

Some add three other cases which they call Ablatives: viz. மலைக்காக, மலையைக் குறித்து, மலையைக் கொண்டு. Still those phrases are altogether improperly attributed to the Ablative, which the Tamulians certainly do not do in their own Grammar. Forasmuch as மலைக்காக is nothing but the Dative of *advantage*, மலைக்கு, with the Infinitive ஆக, from the verb ஆகிறது, *to become*: which infinitive, as in the fourth Chapter I shall more

fully explain, signifies, besides other things, *that it may happen, that it may benefit*: and therefore எனக்காக, means, that it may *be profitable to me, on my account*. The second phrase, மலையைக் குறித்து, is the Accusative case, with the Gerund குறித்து, from the verb குறிக்கிறது, *to intend, to tend towards;* whence that phrase means *intending towards the mountain in respect of the mountain*. So அறத்தைக் குறித்துச் செய, is translated *to operate with an intention of virtue*. The third phrase, மலையைக் கொண்டு, is the Accusative, with the Gerund கொண்டு, from the verb கொள்ளுகிறது: which, besids other things, means *to assume;* and therefore this phrase is well explained by the *Ablative of the Instrument* or *Medium*, or by the preposition *by*. தவத்தைக் கொண்டு கரையேறினுன், is translated, *by assuming the medium of penitence* or *penitence mediating, he was saved*, that is *he was saved by penitence*.

36. I have stated above, that the Vocative generally ends in the letter ē, which, no change being made, is added to the Nominative. I said *generally;* because, although all nouns may well thus form the Vocative, the Tamulians nevertheless often use many other ways also. Wherefore, omitting what concerns only the high dialect, I shall set forth what is in use in the vulgar dialect by a few Rules; of which let the First be:

1. Nouns which end in ஐ, தங்கை *a younger sister*, மங்கை *a woman*, &c. also form the Vocative by changing *ai* into ā or āy. Thus தங்கா, தங்காய், மங்கா, மங்காய்

Rule 2. Nouns which end in *i*, as தம்பி, *a younger brother*, change *i* short into ī long, தம்பீ, & c.

Rule 3. Nouns which end in ன் with a short syllable preceding, as அய்யன், *Lord, Father*, கற்தன், *Lord*, & c. these form the Vocative either by simple detraction, that is by taking away the last consonant, அய்ய, கற்த; or, the last consonant being taken away, they change *a* short into ā long, அய்யா, கற்தா; or they even add to this either ē or ō, and say, அய்யாவே, கற்தாவே, or அய்யாவோ, கற்தாவோ; and this last belongs properly to one calling out with pain. Some also take away ன், and change *a* into *e*; and from அண்ணன், *an elder brother*, comes அண்ணே.

Rule 4. Nouns which end in ன், with a long syllable preceding, vary in this way: either the preceding vowel is ō long, as மூத்தோன், *ancient*, படைத்தோன் *creator*, & c. and then, the ன் being taken away, they add the consonant ய், மூத்தோய், படைத்தோய், & c.; or the preceding vowel is ā long, as வண்ணான் *a washerman;* and then they only take away the ன், and say வண்ணா.

Rule 5. Nouns which end in ள், either in the Singular, as திங்கள் *the moon;* or in the Plural, as generally almost all Nouns do: *e. g.* மக்கள், *sons*; பாவிகள் *sinners*, & c.; from the Vocative in ē long, in the common way, or by changing the last *a* short before ள் into ā long: and it becomes திங்காள், மக்காள், பாவிகாள், &c. And this is much the more elegant way.

37. The Terminations of the cases which I have mentioned, viz. இன், கு, ஐ, ஏ, இல், ஆல், ஓடு, are indeed common to all Nouns, and this as well in the Singular number which they call ஒருமை, as in the Plural which they call பன்மை. Nevertheless, although those terminations are wont to be added to most Nouns, without any change whatever in the Nominative, as you may see in the example above adduced of the Noun மலை; there are some notwithstanding which as they pass from the Nominative to the terminations of the other cases, are by the way considerably changed; which I shall here show. All Nouns in this language end, either in the following vowels, ஆ, மாதா, *a mother;* இ, தம்பி, *a brother;* ஈ, ஈ, *a fly;* உ, மருந்து, *medicine;* ஊ, பூ, *a flower* ஐ, மலை, *a mountain;* or they end in the following consonants, ண், கண், *the eye;* ம், முகம், *the countenance;* ய், வாய், *the mouth;* ர், மயிர், *the hair;* ல், மயில், *a peacock;* ழ், புகழ், *praise;* ள், தூள், *dust;* ன், பலன், *a reward.* From these if you except those which end in ம், all the others are well declined by adding the above stated terminations of the cases, without any change in the form of the Nominative. Observe however, according to the Rules we have given, Numbers 13 and 14, that the letter வ், as if to unite them, is to be interposed between those which end in ā or ū: மாதா, மாதாவின், &c. பூ, பூவின், &c. But between those which end in இ, ஈ, or ஐ, ய், is to be written: தம்பி, தம்பியின்; ஈ, ஈயின்; மலை, மலையின், &c. Those which end in *u*, as in the same place we stated,

generally strike out the *u*: மருந்து, மருந்தின், &c. From these, except those, which, as we then also stated, do not strike out *u*, but add வ்; நடு நடுவின்; குரு, குருவின், &c. இது, அது, the *u* being struck out, have இதின், அதின், &c. Those however which end in a consonant add over and above to the last consonant, the vowel by which the endings of the cases are formed, that consonant being doubled if the word be a monosyllable and short. Thus கண்ணின், வாயின், மயிரின், மயிலின், புகழின், தூளின், பலனின். Moreover the termination of the Dative is கு, as we have stated: nevertheless nouns which end in another vowel which is not ஐ, இ, ஈ; or end in a comsonant which is not ய், interpose உ, and it becomes உக்கு. Thus மாதா, மாதாவுக்கு; பூ, பூவுக்கு; மது, மதுவுக்கு; கோ, கோவுக்கு, &c. Those however which ought to strike out *u* final, as மருந்து, கழுத்து, &c. have மருந்துக்கு, கழுத்துக்கு, &c. But those which end in a consonant, as I have said, have உக்கு. Thus கண், கண்ணுக்கு; மயிர், மயிருக்கு; மயில், மயிலுக்கு; புகழ், புகழுக்கு; மகள், மகளுக்கு; மகன், மகனுக்கு &c. But those which end in ஐ, இ, ஈ or the consonant ய், do not add உ, Thus மலைக்கு, தம்பிக்கு, ஈக்கு, பொய்க்கு, நோய்க்கு, &c. Which may happen in those ending in ர், ல், ன்; the ல் however and the ன் being changed into ற்; thus பயிர், பயிர்க்கு; மயில், மயிற்கு; மகன், மகற்கு; அவன், அவற்கு, &c. Moreover Pronouns, in the Dative, add அ, and it becomes அக்கு: thus எனக்கு, உனக்கு, தனக்கு, நமக்கு, உமக்கு, தமக்கு. But some Nouns, which imply *time*, add ஐ, and it becomes

ஐக்கு: thus, நாள் *a day;* has நாளைக்கு; இப்போது *now,* இப்போதைக்கு; இன்று *to-day,* இன்றைக்கு: அன்று *then,* அன்றைக்கு; என்று *when,* என்றைக்கு; என்றும் *always,* என்றைக்கும்; so என்றென்றைக்கும், &c. These however in the other cases observe the common Rule.

38. For the better understanding of these things I will here add a Noun declined throughout the cases, as an example of the rest.

N. மாதா, *a Mother*

G. மாதா-வின், or-வினுடைய, or மாதா-வுடைய, *of a Mother.*

D. மாதா-வுக்கு, *to a Mother*

Ac. மாதா-வை, *a Mother.*

V. மாதா-வே, *O Mother.*

Abl. 1. மாதா-வில், or-விடத்தில், or-வினிடத்தில் *in a Mother*

Abl. 2. மாதா-வால், or-வினால், *from or by a Mother*

Abl. 3. மாதா-வோடு, or-வினோடு, *with a Mother.*

But to these three Ablatives, the letter ē, as I have said may be added at the end; மாதாவிலே, மாதாவினாலே, மாதாவோடே.

39. *Appendix*: In Nouns which end in டு or று, with no consonant preceding those syllable; but preceding which, is, either one syllabll which may be long, as வீடு *a house,* ஆறு *a river,* &c. then the form of the Nominative doubles the last consonant ட or ற, in all the oblique cases except the Vocative, and then assumes the above

mentioned forms of the cases, ŭ being always struck out. Thus from வீடு comes வீட்டின், வீட்டுக்கு, வீட்டை, வீடே, வீட்டில், வீட்டால், வீட்டோடு. So from ஆறு comes ஆற்றின், ஆற்றுக்கு, ஆற்றை, & c. This Rule is universal even in dissyllables, if only *the first syllable be long,* as we have said; for if the first syllable be short, if would follow the general rule. Thus from நாடு *a region,* comes நாட்டின், & c. because the first syllable is long: but from நடு the *middle,* because the first syllable is short, comes not நாட்டின், but in the way common to all, நடுவின், & c. So from மறு *a spot,* since the first is short, comes not மற்றின், but மறுவின், & c. Equally if before டு or று, there are syllables, short indeed, but more (than two): then, doubling ட or ற, we ought to follow the Rule of this Appendix. Thus from தகடு *thin plates,* comes தகட்டின், தகட்டுக்கு, & c. from கயிறு, *a cord,* comes கயிற்றின், கயிற்றுக்கு, & c. Here we must especially be careful, that த்தி be not written instead of ற்றி, although these may seem to be pronounced with nearly the same sound: forasmuch as the general rule is, that words derived from று, which, in speaking, double ற, can never be written with த. Thus from தேறுகிறது, comes தேற்றுகிறது; from வேறு comes வேற்று, & c. Nor let any one think this Rule to be of little moment, forasmuch as, if you write for example வயத்தை, it is the Accusative from வயம், *force;* and வயற்றை is the Accusative from வயறு, *the belly.* So பயத்தை from பயம் *fear;* and பயற்றை, from பயறு, *a kind of pulse,* & c. Wherefore this Rule must be diligently observed.

40. Finally Nouns which end in ம், in all other cases except the Vocative, (in which no change being made they add ē), reject ம், and add double த்; to which are united the terminations of the cases. Thus from முகம் the *countenance* comes.

N.	முகம்,	*a Face.*
G.	முகத்தி-ன், or முகத்தி-னுடைய,	*of a Face.*
D.	முகத்து-க்கு,	*to a Face.*
Ac.	முகத்-தை,	*a Face.*
V.	முக-மே,	*O Face !*
Abl. 1.	முகத்தி-ல், or முகத்தி-டத்தில்,	*in a Face.*
Abl. 2.	முகத்-தால், or முகத்தி-னல்,	*from or by a Face.*
Abl. 3.	முகத்-தோடு, or முகத்தி-னோடு,	*with a Face.*

41. We have stated that the termination of the cases are common also to the Plural Number: it is enough therefore to know the Rules by which the Nominative Plural is formed from the Nominative Singular: which Rule varies. Let this then be.

Rule 1. Nouns which end in a long vowel always from the Plural by adding க்கள்: thus from கனு, கனுக்கள்; from கிடா, கிடாக்கள்; from ஈ, ஈக்கள்; from பூ, பூக்கள் &c.

Rule 2. These which end in இ, உ, ஐ, have in the Plural கள், the க not being doubled; thus from விழி, விழிகள்; from மணி, மணிகள்; from விருந்து, விருந்துகள்; from எருது, எருதுகள்; from மாடு, மாடுகள்; from மலை, மலைகள்; from ஆலை, ஆலைகள்; &c. From these except, first, the names of men, which although they may have

a Plural according to this Rule generally terminate it also in மார்: thus சுவாமிகள் or சுவாமிமார், செட்டிகள் or செட்டிமார், தம்பிகள் or தம்பிமார், தமக்கைகள் or தமக்கைமார், &c. Except, besides, more, which end in *u*, which in the Plural double the க; thus குருக்கள், சத்துருக்கள்; சம்மனசுக்கள்; பெண்டுக்கள்; தெருக்கள், &c. for which no certain rule besides custom can be assigned.

Rule 3. Those which end in a consonant add கள்; thus கண்கள், முகங்கள்; வாய்கள்; மயிர்கள்; மயில்கள்; புகழ்கள்; தூள்கள்; பலன்கள் &c. From these except Masculines ending in ன், for these in the Plural change ன் into ர்: thus, for example, மூத்தோன், மூத்தோர்; தேவன், தேவர்; கர்த்தன், கர்த்தர்; மனுஷன், மனுஷர்; ஊரான், ஊரார்; &c. From these except மகன் *a son:* although in the high dialect I may for the plural property say மகர், *maguer, sons and daughters:* still in the vulgar dialect it is not usual, and it is said மக்கள். Except தகப்பன், அண்ணன், தோழன், from which comes தகப்பமார், அண்ணமார், தோழமார்: this last is also called தோழர். Observe that those, which in the Plural have ர், may add கள் to this thus, தேவர், தேவர்கள், &c. Except finally a few, which although they end in a consonant, double க in the Plural: as from ஆள், ஆள்க்கள்; from நாள், நாள்க்கள்; and yet from வாள், comes, not வாள்க்கள், but in accordance with the general rule, வாள்கள்: in all these custom supplants the rule. Observe however here, that the Tamulians themselves openly teach, that neuter Nouns are often used in the singular for the plural number: thus பத்துக்

குதிரை *ten horses;;* மரமெல்லாம் *all trees;* பல கறி *more dishes,* & c.

42. But the Nominative having been given according to these Rules, the Plural number may be declined still more easily than the singular: for no change being made from the Nominative, the terminations of cases which I have given above, are added to all the cases indis-Iriminately. Thus for example:

N.	முகங்க-ள்,	*Faces.*
G.	முகங்க-ளின், or முகங்க-ளுடைய,	*of Faces.*
D.	முகங்க-ளுக்கு,	*to Faces.*
Ac.	முகங்க-ளை,	*Faces.*
V.	முகங்க-ளே!	*O Faces!*
Abl. 1.	முகங்க-ளில், or ளிடத்தில்,	*in Faces.*
Abl. 2.	முகங்க-ளால், ளினால்	*-from or by Faces.*
Abl. 3.	முகங்க-ளோடு, or ளினோடு,	*with Faces.*

SECTION II.

Of Adjectives.

43. The Tamulians call Noun Adjective உரிச்சொல், as though they would say *words of property or quality*. This language abounds in Nouns properly Adjective, although commonly we use but few: *e. g.* பல, *more;* சில *some;* நல *good;* புது *new;* பொது *universal;* அரிய *difficult;* பெரிய *great;* சிறிய *little;* உரிய *proper;* இனிய *sweet;* &c.

Besides these, they call Nouns Substantive themselves, Adjectives, if they are used in the way of Adjectives; in this manner.

1. Those which end in ம், generally reject this and are joined to another Noun, and become Adjectives Thus from ஞானம், *spirituality*, comes ஞானப் போசனம், *spiritual food;* from சுத்தம், *purity*, comes சுத்த மனசு *a pure will*, &c. These become Adjectives in another mode also, viz. by changing ம், into த்து. Thus from புறம் *the outside*, comes either புறப் பொருள் or புறத்துப் பொருள் *an outward thing:* from முகம், *the face*, comes either முகச்ச சாயல், or முகத்துச் சாயல், *the face's form:* from சுரம், *a desert*, comes சுரப் பாதை or சுரத்துப் பாதை, a way *through a desert*, &c.

2. Those which end in மை, generally reject this add *iya*, and become Adjectives. Thus from கொடுமை, *a barbarism*, comes கொடிய மனசு, *a barbarous will*: from அருமை, *difficulty*, comes அரிய கற்பனை, *a difficult precept*, &c.

3. Those which end in து, டு, று, single, become Adjectives by doubling த, ட, ற. Thus from எருது, an ox, comes எருத்துப் பாரம் *the weight which the ox usually carries*: from காடு, *a wood*; comes காட்டு வழி, *a woody way, a way through a wood*; from வயிறு, the *belly*, comes வயிற்று வலி, *a belly ache;* from ஆறு, *a river*, comes ஆற்று மணல், *river sand*. And also, those which end in *mbu:* for these generally, by changing *m* into *p*, becomes Adjectives. Thus from இரும்பு *iron* comes இருப்புக் கோல், *an iron rod*, & c.

4. Finally the rest of the Nouns, without any change being made, if they are added to other Nouns, are taken as Adjectives: thus குளிர் காற்று, *a cold wind;* கல் வீடு, *a stone house*, பொறுமை மனுஷன், a *patient man*, & c. They use besides other phrases, which are in truth equivalent to Adjectives; but neither do they themselves call them, nor ought they to be called Adjectives: thus if to a Noun, which we wish to take as an Adjective, there be added the participle ஆன or உள்ள, and it be said சுத்தமான மனசு, or சுத்தமுள்ள மனசு, it can be translated, *a pure will*, properly however it is *a will which has purity* or *which is purity*. Whence they are phrases, not Adjectives.

44. The Rules which relate to the use of Ajectives are altogether easy; forasmuch as all Adjectives never vary, neither in gender, nor number, nor case. This one thing must be observed, that they may always be placed immediately before the principla Noun. Some

except எல்லாம், which is put after it; but it is not to be excepted, since it is a Noun Substantive, which if it becomes an Adjective, like all those, which end in ம், rejects this, and is always placed before: thus எல்லாச் சாதிகள், *all tribes*. எல்லாப் பொருள், *all existences*. But if it be placed after, it is, for the neuter gender, expressed எல்லாம், and better எல்லாமும் but for the Masculine and Feminine, it is expressed எல்லாரும், and then it is declined in the ordinary way: எல்லாமும், எல்லாத்தினும், எல்லாத்துக்கும், எல்லாத்தையும், &c. thus எல்லாரும், எல்லாருடையவும், எல்லாருக்கும், எல்லாரையும், &c.

SECTION III.

Of Pronouns.

45. Of the Pronouns, the Demonstrative are called சுட்டுச் சொல்; those which serve for Interrogation, வினாச் சொல்; since சுட்டுகிறது is *to demonstrate*, and வினாவுகிறது is *to Interrogate*. But in this language there are no relative pronouns, besides the words which serve for Interrogation, nor any possessive: and derivative pronouns, although they may exist in the more elegant dialect called செந்தமிழ், in this are not used. Tne Primitive pronouns, *I*, நான்; *Thou*, நீய்; *We*, நாம், or நாங்கள்; *You*, நீங்கள்; vary much in their declension as will soon be evident. The rest are declined in the same way as nouns substative, nor do they differ much in the oblique cases from the Nominative.

N. நான், *I.*,

G. என், or என்னுடைய, *of me.*

D. எனக்கு, *to me.*

A. என்னை, *me*

Abl. 1. என்னில், or என்னிடத்தில், *in me.*

Abl. 2. என்னால், *from or by me.*

Abl. 3. என்னோடு, *with me.*

So N. நீய், *Thou.*

G. உன், or உன்னுடைய, *of thee.*

D. உனக்கு, *to thee.*

Ac. உன்னை, *thee.*

Abl. 1. உன்னில், or உன்னிடத்தில், *in thee.*

Abl. 2. உன்னால், *from or by thee.*

Abl. 3. உன்னோடு, *with thee.*

So. தான், (*ipse, ipsa, ipsum.*)

N. தான், *himself,*

G. தன், or தன்னுடைய, *of himself,*

D. தனக்கு, *to himself,*

A. தன்னை, *himself,*

Abl. 1. தன்னில் or தன்னிடத்தில், *in himself,*

Abl. 2. தன்னால், *from or by himself,*

Abl. 3. தன்னோடு, *with himself,*

This Pronoun as well by custom as by signification, is equivalent to the reciprocal (suus, sua, suum) *his, hers, its,* and (sui, sibi, se) *of himself, to herself, himself*: in this only it differs, that it has a Plural, as I shall describe below, which the reciprocal (sui, sibi, se) has not. But these three Pronouns have each a double Plural: from நான், comes நாம் and நாங்கள், *we;* from நீய், comes நீர், and நீங்கள், *you,* from தான் comes தாம் and தாங்கள், *themselves.* Of these நாம், நீர், தாம், are used honorarily for the Singular Number: as if a King for example should say நாங் கட்டளையிட்டோம், *We have ordered*; and by way of honour a Son should say to a Father, நீரிரும், *sit you down,* instead of saying, நீ யிரு, *sit thou down*: so குருத் தாமே வந்தார், *the Priest himself is Coming.* Of these நாம் has in the oblique G. நமது or நம்முடைய: and நீர் has உமது or உம்முடைய; thus in the other cases they are declined as in the Singular நமக்கு, உமக்கு, தமக்கு, நம்மை, உம்மை, தம்மை, &c. Here observe these three

Pronouns even in the Singular have the Genitive in அது: thus எனது, உனது, தனது; and in each number the Dative is formed not in உக்கு but in அக்கு, as appears from what is said; எனக்கு, உனக்கு, தனக்கு, நமக்கு, உமக்கு, தமக்கு, which elsewhere never happens.

46. We use the word நாம், *we*, not only honorarily for the Singular, as we have stated, but also for the Plural: still it differs from the Plural நாங்கள், *we*, The difference is this; நாங்கள், includes the speaker and others, whom from the context it appears he wishes to be included, and always excludes him or them with whom we are speaking but நாம், includes both speakers and hearers. Thus in addressing neophytes, we should not well say,

ஸ
நாங்கள் கிறிதவர்கள்: for it would be as if we should say, *we priests are Christians, but you not*; which is untrue; but

ஸ
including themselves also we must say, நாங் கிறிதவர்கள் But if we are addressing Gentiles, since they are not Christians, we must say, not நாம், but, in order to exclude

ஸ
them, நாங்கள் கிறிதவர்கள். But the mode of declinin நாங்கள், *we*, நீங்கள் *you* is easy; for the first syllable in each being taken away, ê short is instead of it added to the former and û short to the latter, and the common terminations of the cases are joined at the end. Thus

N. நாங்கள்,

G. எங்கள் or எங்களுடைய,

D எங்களுக்கு,

A. எங்களை, &c.
N. நீங்கள்,
G. உங்கள் or உங்களுடைய,
D. உங்களுக்கு,
A. உங்களை, &c.

But தாங்கள், *themselves,* changing ā long into â short, is, declined in the same way.

N. தங்கள்,
G. தங்கள் or தங்களுடைய,
D. தங்களுக்கு,
A. தங்களை, &c.

The other Pronouns are declined still more easiy: இவன், *he,* இவள், *she,* இது, *it,* அவன், *he,* அவள், *she,* அது, *it;* எவன், *who?* (M.) எவள், *who?* (F.) எது, *what?* (N.). For they follow the common rule without any change.

N.	இவன்,	*he.*
G.	இவனுடைய,	*of him.*
D.	இவனுக்கு,	*to him.*
Ac.	இவனை,	*him.*
Abl. 1.	இவனிடத்தில்,	*in him.*
Abl. 2.	இவனால்,	*by him.*
Abl. 3.	இவனோடு,	*with him.*

And thus the other Masculines and Feminines. But the Neuters strike out *u,* are thus declined.

N.	இது,	*it.*
G.	இதின், or இதனுடைய,	*of itt.*

D.	இதுக்கு, or இதற்கு,	*to it.*
Ac.	இதை, or இத்தை, or இதனே,	*it.*
Abl. 1.	இதில்,	*in it.*
Abl. 2.	இதஞல்,	*by it.*
Abl. 3.	இத்தோடு, or இதனோடு,	*with it.*

And so the others.

But in the plural number the Masculines change ன் into ர்; இவர், அவர், எவர். G. இவருடைய, D. இவருக்கு or இவர்க்கு, & c., in the common way; and this plural we use honorarily for the singular. There is another plural,: which adds கள் to the first; இவர்கள், அவர்கள், எவர்கள்; and these serve as well for the masculine as the feminine plural, and are declined also in the common way; இவர்களுடைய, இவர்களுக்கு, & c. The Brahmins especially for இவர்கள், அவர்கள், say இவாள், அவாள், *ivāl, avāl:* which in reality is confirmed by no rule. Instead of the Pronoun எவன் *who?* & c. there is also a word, ஆர் or யார், which serves for the Singular and Plural, Masculine and Feminine: ஆரிவன், ஆரிவள், ஆரிவர்கள், & c. and is declined in the ordinary way; ஆருடைய, ஆருக்கு, ஆரை, & c. But Pronouns neuter become plural by adding கள் thus இதுகள், அதுகள், எதுகள், G. இதுகளுடைய, D. இதுகளுக்கு, & c. in the common way.

NOTE BY TRANSLATOR. - As the above may seem a little confused, I beg to add here the several pronouns declined in full, and properly arranged.

Singular,		*Honorary,*	*Plural.*
N. நான்,	*I*	நாம்,	நாங்கள்.
G. என், என்னுடைய, எனது,	*of Me*	நமது, நம்முடைய,	எங்கள், எங்களுடைய.
D. எனக்கு,	*to Me*	நமக்கு,	எங்களுக்கு.
AC. என்னை,	*Me*	நம்மை,	
Abl. 1. என்னில், என்னிடத்தில்,	*in Me*	நம்மிடத்தில்,	எங்களை. எங்களில்.
Abl. 2. என்னால்,	*by Me*	நம்மால்,	எங்களால்.
Abl. 3. என்னோடு, என்னுடன்,	*with Me*	நம்மோடு,	எங்களோடு

Singular,		*Honorary,*	*Plural,*
N. நீய்,	*Thou*	நீர்,	நீங்கள்.
G. உன், உன்னுடைய, உனது,	*of Thee*	உமது, உம்முடைய,	உங்கள், உங்களுடைய.
D. உனக்கு,	*to Thee*	உமக்கு	உங்களுக்கு.
AC. உன்னை.	*Thee*	உம்மை,	உங்களை.
Abl. 1. உன்னில், உன்னிடத்தில்,	*in Thee*	உம்மிடத்தில், உம்மிலே,	உங்களில், உங்களிடத்தில்.
Abl. 2. உன்னால்,	*by Thee*	உம்மால்	உங்களால்.
Abl. 3. உன்னோடு	*withThee*	உம்மோடு,	உங்களோடு.

	Singular		Honorary.	Plural.
N.	தான்,	He, She, It-self	தாம்,	தங்கள்.
G.	தன், தன்னுடைய, தனது,	of (-) self	தமது, தம்முடைய,	தங்கள், தங்களுடைய.
D.	தனக்கு,	to (-) self	தமக்கு,	தங்களுக்கு.
Ac.	தன்னை,	(-) self	தம்மை,	தங்களை,
Abl. 1.	தன்னில், தன்னிடத்தில்,	in (-) self	தம்மில், தம்மிடத்தில்,	தங்களில், தங்களிடத்தில்.
Abl. 2.	தன்னால்,	by (-) self	தம்மால்,	தங்களால்,
Abl. 3.	தன்னோடு,	with(-)self	தம்மோடு,	தங்களோடு.

	Singular.				Honorary.	Plural.
	Masc.		Fem.		M.and F.	M. andF.
N.,	இவன்,	He	இவள்,	She	இவர்,	இவர்கள்
G.	இவனுடைய,	of Him	இவளுடைய,	of Her	இவருடைய,	இவர்களுடைய இவர்களது.
D.	இவனுக்கு,	to Him	இவளுக்கு,	to Her	இவர்க்கு,	இவர்களுக்கு.
Ac.	இவனை,	Him	இவளை,	Her	இவரை,	இவர்களை,
Abl. 1.	இவனிடத்தில்,	in Him	இவளிடத்தில்,	in Her	இவரிடத்தில்,	இவர்களிடத்தில், இவர்களிலே,
Abl. 2.	இவனால்,	by Him	இவளால்,	by Her	இவரால்,	இவர்களால்.
Abl. 3.	இவனொடு,	with Him	இவளோடு	with Her	இவரோடு,	இவர்களோடு

	Singular.		Plural.	
	Neuter.		Neuter.	
N.	இது,	*It*	இதுகள்,	*They.*
G.	இதின், இதினுடைய,	*of It*	இதுகளுடைய, இதுகளின்,	*of Them.*
D.	இதுக்கு,	*to It*	இதுகளுக்கு,	*to Them.*
Ac.	இதை, இத்தை,	*It*	இதுகளை,	*Them.*
Abl. 1.	இதில், இதினிடத்தில், இதிலே,	*in It*	இதுகளிடத்தில், இதுகளிலே,	*in Them.*
Abl. 2.	இத்தால், இதனால், இதாலே,	*by It*	இதுகளால்,	*by Them.*
Abl. 3.	இத்தோடு, இதனோடு, இதனோட,	*with It*	இதுகளோடு,	*with Them.*

The Pronoun இவன் (Masc.) இவள் (Fem.) இது (Neut.) *This*; and the Interrogatives எவன் (Masc.) எவள் (Fem.) எது (Neut.) *Which?* are declined in the same way

SECTION IV.

Of the Pronoun Adjective.

48. In this language there are certain words, which have the same signification as pronouns, but as we have above stated of Adjectives, never vary either in gender, number, or case, but always immediately precede their own substantive: hence it has seemed right to call these words Pronouns Adjective. But they are (1) இந்த, *this,* (2) அந்த, *that;* as அந்தச் சாதி, *that tribe;* அந்தக் கன்னி, *that virgin;* அந்தக் காடு, *that forest.* (3) எந்த, *who* or *what?* எந்தச் சொல்லிது, *what voice is this?* & c.

49. The Tamulians use also other words instead or this Adjective.

1. For இந்த, they say இன்ன; for அந்த, அன்ன; for எந்த, என்ன; their signification and use is the same. They differ in this one thing, that those do not double the following letter, as the first do; they say இந்தச் சொல், and இன்ன சொல், & c. Of these என்ன; is used not only as an Abjective, but also by itself; and it is placed before a verb, it signifies *what?* என்ன சொன்னாய், *what has thou said?* It it is put after the verb, it signifies *If any?* சொன்னா யென்ன, *didst thou say anything?* but if என்ன, is put after a verbal from a participle, it signifies *what?* or *wherefore?* Thus நீய் சொன்ன தென்ன *what hast thou said?* நீ யிப்படி சொன்ன தென்ன, *wherefore hast thou said thus?* Moreover from these three Adjectives proceed Pronouns Substantive in this way: M. இன்னான், F. இன்னாள், N. இன்னது: *that* or *such as;* அன்னான், *he;* அன்னாள், *she;* அன்

னது *it;* M. எனனான், F. என்னாள், *who;* N. என்னது, *what?* which all are well declined: இன்னானுடைய, இன்னானுக்கு, &c. So என்னதின், என்னத்துக்கு, என்னத்தை, &c. But they say இன்னான் வந்தான், *that man has come,* or *such a man has come,* &c. They signify also the same as *who? what?* Thus அவனை யின்னானென்றான், *he said, who pray might he be?* நீய் செய்த பாவமின்னதென்று சொல்லு, *tell what may the sin be, which thou hast committed;* etc.

50. (2) More shortly still, instead of these three Adjectives they use three letters, இ, அ, எ, which they call சுட்டெழுத்து, *letters indicative:* thus இப்படி, is இந்தப்படி: அத் தறுவாய் is அந்தத் தறுவாய்; எவ்வளவு, is எந்த வளவு. &c. For the use of these letters the Rule may be this: if the word to which those letters are joined, begins with a vowel, there are always interposed two *v v* (consonants); thus from அளவு comes இவ்வளவு, அவ்வளவு, எவ்வளவு, &c. If the following word begins with a consonant, this, whatever it be, is always itself doubled: thus from கரை, இக்கரை; from போது, இப்போது; from மாத்திரம், இம்மாத்திரம்; from வண்ணம், இவ்வண்ணம்; from நாள், இந்நாள்: nor can it be written இன்னாள், for then the same letter would not be doubled, which is ந, but others would be substituted in place of it, and இன்னாள். as we have stated above, is a Pronoun Feminine. In the same way அக்கரை, எக்கரை; அப்போது, எப்போது &c. This method is elegant and very easy, and in some words much in use, and we may always use it elegantly. Hence, when some, that they may say, *e.g this bank of the*

river, say இந்தவிக்கரை, they foolishly entirely mistake: for it is the same as to say, *that this bank;* when it suffices to say, either இக்கரை or இந்தக்கரை; for both well signify *this bank:* in the same way we should say, not அந்தவக்கரை, but either அக்கரை, or அந்தக் கரை, *that bank, &c.*

SECTION V.

Of the Genders.

51. From what has been said thus far, it seems that in this language, there either in no difference of Gender or that such difference is not necessary; forasmuch as, whilst with us (that is in Latin) the Genders are distinguished by the adjectives and articles, the Tamulians, as we have stated, distinguish by gender neither adjectives nor articles. Nevertheless, they distinguish the genders by the third person of the verbs, a thing peculiar to this language: and while we should say *e. g. venit,* for every gender, the Tamulians say for the masculine வந்தான், for the feminine வந்தாள் for the neuter வந்தது; as in the following chapter we shall state more fully. They also well distinguish by gender the pronouns, *that, he, who?* as we have stated above: இவன், இவள், இது; அவன், அவள், அது, & c. The Rules for the genders in this language, however, give almost no trouble. In Sanscrit the genders are called லிங்கம்; hence the masculine is called புலிங்கம், the feminine இஸ்திரீலிங்கம், and the neuter நபுஞ்சகலிங்கம். But in Tamul the genders are called, by a common term, திணை. First, the Tamulians distinguish only two genders, the first of which they call உயர் திணை, *the sublime gender*: but the second அஃறிணை, where the letter ஃ, common in the high dialect, and called ஆய்த வெழுத்து, is pronounced like the guttural consonant *g;* whence it is called *Agrinei, i. e., the inferior gender,* and it is the neuter. The first is common to males

and females: which afterward is distinguished as ஆண் பால் *ānpāl*, which is the *masculin*, & c. பெண்பால், *penpāl*, which is the *feminine*. All rotional beings are of the sublime gender amongst which, God, Angels and Men are of the masculine gender; women of the feminine; all other things without exception are neuter. Amongst those masculine, God and Angels are used also in the neuter gender; in like manner they join the neuter gender to men, whom they wish to honor very greatly; thus குருசுவாமி யெழுந்தருளிற்று, *the prist has come*, & *c*. Except besides the noun பிள்ளை, when it signifies, *a son*; for that they use both in the masculine and the neuter gender. But the noun குழந்தை *an infant*, is always of the neuter gender.

CHAPTER III

OF THE VERB

SECTION I.

Of the Conjugation of Verbs, and first of the Present Tense.

52. The Verb, which the Tamulians call வினை, is conjugated as with us, in three Persons, which they name மூவிடம்: of which they call the first தன்மை; the second முன்னிலை; and the third படர்க்கை. In the two first persons they do not distinguish the genders, but only in the third: and even this is distinguished by the masculine, feminine and neuter genders in the singular number only: but in the plural the neuter is only distinguished *from that which is not neuter,* and the same word serves for masculine as well as feminine. Moreover the Tamulians distinguish only three Tenses, which they call முக்காலம்: they are நிகழ் காலம், *time passing,* which is the Present Tense; இறந்த காலம், *time elapsed,* which is the Praeterite; எதிர் காலம், *time approaching,* which is the Future. The final terminations of all the Tenses are altogether the same. Thus for the singular number, the *first* person has at the end ஏன்; the *second* ஆய்; the *third* masculine ஆன், feminine ஆள், but the neuter து, or in the future உம். For the Plural, the *first* has ஓம்; the *second* ஈர்கள்: the *third,* masculine and feminine ஆர்கள்; but the neuter as in the singular. Besides these, they add another second and third person, which they use, as in token of honor, for the singular number; of which the

second person ends in ஈர், and the third in ஆர். Where-fore it is enough, for the conjugation of verbs, to know the first person of each tense, and by only changing the termination according to the Rule given, any verbs you please are easily conjugated There is some difficulty in finding the first form of the tenses, to do which these are the Rules.

53. About the Present there is certainly no difficulty: for since all verbs are named from the verbal கிறது, the க being doubled or not, by changing this termination into கிறேன், we have the first person of the Present, and from this the other persons. Hence கிறாய், is the common second; கிறீர், the honorary second; கிறான் the common third masculine; கிறார், the honorary third; கிறாள், the third feminine; குது, the third neuter; and these for the singular. But in the Plural number, கிறோம், is the first person; கிறீர்கள், the second; கிறார்கள், the third, for the masculine and feminine; and குது, the third of the neuter. Thus, from the verb செய்கிறது, *to make* or *do*, the Present is:

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular

1st Person		செய்-கிறேன்,	*I make*
2nd		செய்-கிறாய்,	*Thou makest.*
3rd	Masculine	செய்-கிறான்,	*He makes.*
,,	Feminine	செய்-கிறாள்,	*She makes.*
,,	Neuter	செய்-குது,	*It makes*

Honorary.

1st	செய்-கிறோம்,	*I make.*
2nd	செய்-கிறீர்,	*Thou makest.*
3rd	செய்-கிறார்,	*He or She makes.*

Plural.

1st		செய்-கிறோம்,	*We make.*
2nd		செய்-கிறீர்கள்,	*You make.*
3rd	M. and F.	செய்-கிறார்கள்,	*They make.*
,,	N.	செய்-குது,	*They make.*

I add that the third person neuter, instead of ending in குது as we have stated, ends also in உது. The verbs, for instance, which have *u* before *கிறது*, rejecting *கிறது*, add து: thus from சொல்லுகிறது comes சொல்லுது, &c. Those which have ஐ, or the consonant ய், before கிறது, rejecting கிறது, add either குது, or more elegantly யுது; thus from நைகிறது comes நைகுது, or நையுது; from செய்கிறது comes செய்குது, or செய்யுது; from மேய்கிறது comes மேய்குது, or மேயுது, &c. For this last, since a long vowel precedes it, does not double ய், as செய்கிறது, since the first is short. Observe that the present is often used for the future, and especially in the epistolary style.

SECTION II.

Of the Praeterite.

54. About the praeterite there is more difficulty; forasmuch as there are both more rules for praeterites, and of these there is scarcely one which does not require much exception. Lest however beginners finding no path before them, should themselves begin to stray at random we will give some methodically compiled rules, confining the way as it were with hedges: we will notice here the greater number of the exeeptions from these rules; the rest they themselves will soon learn, after wandering for a short time. That those, who desire to learn this language, may however both more easily retain, and have ready at a nod, the rules for praeterites, which I have determined to lay down here, it is my humor to bind them in a bundle as it were, in these eight versicles;

Quae prope praecedit *cradu* vel *gradu*, littera monstrat
Praeteritum; his, quae *ca* duplicant, haec regula constet:
Consona *ya, ra, i, u, ai, ten*; *a* dabit *anden.*
Omnia longa *kinen* copulant. Ast in *gradu* verbis,
Nga, guinen; na, den; na, den; dant; *u* fere semper
Addit *inēn* *lu, ru, lu, dēn, aēn, dēn,* sibi poscunt:
lu variat: *ya, i, ai, nden* dant: longa vagantur.
Usus plura tamen passim variare docebit*

---

* Note: — These barbarous lines may be rendered barbarously thns;

க்கிறது கிறது

The letter next preceding *cradu* or *gradu* shows

க

The Praeterite: for those which double *ca* the rule is this;

ய் ர் இ உ ஐ த்தேன்

Ya consonant. and *ra. i, u,* and *ai* give *tēn;*

அ அந்தேன் க்கினேன்

A anden gives; all along unite with *kinen.* But in verbs

கிறது ங் கினேன் ண் டேன் ன் றேன்

In *gradu. nga* gives *guinen; na, den; na den* give;

உ இனேன் ளு டேன் ரு தேன் லு றேன்

U commonly *adds inēn; lu* demands *dēn; ru dēn; lu, dēn;*

ழு ய இ ஐ ந்தேன்

Lu varies *ya,* i, and *ai* give *ndēn;* ;ong vowels vary;

Experience will teach yet more, on all sides, vary.

Wherefore *the letter which next precedes cradu or gradu shows the praeteriete.* For all verbs, as we have already said, end either in க்கிறது, or in கிறது; and the rule of the Praeterite is taken from the letter which immediately precedes this termination. Hence *for those which double ca the rule is this*; for Verbs, that is, which end in க்கிறது, the க் being doubled, these are the Rules.

55. Rule 1. *The Consonant* ய, ர, இ,உ,ஐ, *give* த்தேன். Verbs, which before க்கிறது have the consonants ய் or ர், have the praeterite in த்தேன். Thus மேய்க்கிறது, to feed மேய்த்தேன்; மொய்க்கிறது, *to agglomerate,* மொய்த்தேன். So வளர்க்கிறது, *to nourish,* வளர்த்தேன்; தீர்க்கிறது, *to end strife,* தீர்த்தேன்; பார்க்கிறது, *to see,* பார்த்தேன், &c. In the same way those which have *i,* or *ai,* or *u,* before க்கிறது, have *ten* in the praeterite. Thus விரிக்கிறது, *to extent*

விரித்தேன்; படிக்கிறது, *to learn,* படித்தேன். So படைக்கிறது, *to create,* படைத்தேன்; உதைக்கிறது, *to kick with the heel.* உதைத்தேன். So படுக்கிறது *to lie down,* படுத்தேன்; உடுக்கிறது, *to clothe,* உடுத்தேன்; வெளுக்கிறது, *to wash,* வெளுத்தேன், &c. From these except இருக்கிறது; *for it has* இருந்தேன். But this Rule is altogether universal.

56. Rule 2. *A, gives Andén.* Those, that is which have ā ahort before க்கிறது, rejecting க்கிறது, from praeterite by adding ந்தேன். Thus from மறக்கிறது, *to forget,* மறந்தேன்; from பறக்கிறது, *to fly,* பறந்தேன்; from பிறக்கிறது, *to be born,* பிறந்தேன்; from இறக்கிறது, *to descend or die,* இறந்தேன், &c. Except those which have only one syllable before க்கிறது: for these in the praeterite have க்கினேன். Thus from நக்கிறது.; நக்கினேன்; கக்கிறது கக்கினேன்; which in fact end thus by Syncope; for they ought to end in க்குகிறது; நக்குகிறது, கக்குகிறது, and are of the Rule at number 60, as I shall state below. You need not except however மணக்கிறது although another has written, that it has மணக்கினேன், which is not true: for it has according to the general rule, மணந்தேன்.

57 .Rule 3. *All long syllables unite with* க்கினேன்: that is, all which before க்கிறது have a long vowel, form the praeterite in க்கினேன். Thus from ஆக்கிறது, *to make,* ஆக்கினேன்; from நீக்கிறது, *to put to flight,* நீக்கினேன்; from தேக்கிறது *to be filled,* தேக்கினேன்; from தூக்கிறது *to suspend from a cross,* தூக்கினேன்; from நோக்கிறது *to look at,* நோக்கினேன்; and this in a similar way, because they are syncopated from ஆக்குகிறது, &c.: as is evident from

Imperative. Except பூக்கிறது, which, because it is not abbreviated by syncope, has பூத்தேன்: and காக்கிறது, காத்தேன்; which verb when it signifies *to keep watch over* cannot be written, as from ignorance most even of the Tamulians do, கார்க்கிறது *cārcradu*; for when written in this way it does not mean *to keep watch over*, but *to cause* a certain *warmth* of the tongue, such as pepper and similar things occasion; whence that warmth is called காரம், *caram*.

58. And thus much of verbs which end in க்கிறது: I think right to add this one remark. Many verbs by syncope end in க்கிறது, and in truth and in குகிறது, all which, according to the rule which I shall presently give at number 60, have in the praeterite, க்கினேன். But these are generally verbs active from the neuter, which ends in ங்கிறது. Thus அடங்கிறது, *to be shut in*, neuter; அடக்குகிறது and by syncope அடக்கிறது, *to shut in*, active; ஒதுங்கிறது, *to withdraw into a corner*, neuter: ஒதுக்குகிறது or ஒதுக்கிறது, *to put into a corner*, active: நடுங்கிறது, *to tremble*; நடுக்குகிறது or நடுக்கிறது, *to cause to tremble*; நீங்கிறது, *to flee*; நீக்குகிறது or நீக்கிறது, *to put to flight* &c. All these have in the praeterite க்கினேன்; thus அடக்கினேன், ஒதுக்கினேன், நடுக்கினேன், நீக்கினேன், &c. In the same way there are others, which by syncope end in க்கிறது, which of themselves ought to end in க்குகிறது. Thus செதுக்குகிறது, *to scrape up grass*, செதுக்கிறது; முடுக்குகிறது, *to turn to flight* முடுக்கிறது; அடுக்குகிறது, *to put one on another*, அடுக்கிறது, &c. All which

according to the rule which I shall give, have well the praeterite in க்கினேன்; செதுக்கினேன், முடுக்கினேன், அடுக்கினேன் &c. Thus those I have noted above நக்கிறது, க்கிறது, &c. and almost all, which, before க்கிறது, have a long vowel; as ஆக்கிறது, போக்கிறது, &c., which all have க்கினேன், as is said above. Whence all these are not exceptions from the rules I gave just now. In order to distinguish however whether any verb by its own nature may end in க்கிறது, or whether it ends so by syncope, we must have recourse to the word of the Imperative: for if, in the Imperative, the verb நடக்கிறது for example, has நட; and அடக்கிறது has அடக்கு; so ஒதுக்கு, நீக்கு, செதுக்கு, முடுக்கு; so நக்கு, ஆக்கு, போக்கு, &c. Whence all these ought to end in க்குகிறது, and by syncope do terminate in க்கிறது.

59. As to verbs which end in கிறது let the First Rule be *nga guinen*; ண, டேன், ன், றேன். That is to say, those which have ங் before கிறது, have in the praeterite கினேன்; thus வணங்கிறது, *to venerate* வணங்கினேன்; அடங்கிறது, *to shut in*, அடங்கினேன்; இடங்கிறது, *to agree*, இடங்கினேன், &c. Those however which have ண் before கிறது, have in the praeterite டேன்; thus உண்கிறது, *to devour*, உண்டேன்,; *to see*, கண்டேன், which in the praeterite also changes the first long syllable into a short one. Finally those which have the consonant ன் before கிறது, in the praeterite reject கிறது and add றேன்; thus தின்கிறது, *to devour*, தின்றேன்; என்கிறது, *to say*, என்றேன், &c.

60. Rule 2. *U almost always adds Inen.* That is to say if ŭ short comes before *கிறது, கறது* is rejected in the praeterite, and இனேன் almost always added. I have said *almost always*: because if to that *u* there be joined the following consonants, ச, த, ப, either single or double or ண, ன, வ, ம; the praeterite always has இனேன். Thus பேசுகிறது, *to speak* பேசினேன்; நச்சுகிறது, *to desire*, நச்சினேன்; எழுதுகிறது, *to write*, எழுதினேன்; திருத்துகிறது, *to perform*, திருத்தினேன்; நம்புகிறது, *to confide*, நம்பினேன்; அப்புகிறது, *to fix one on another*, அப்பினேன்; பண்ணுகிறது, *to make*, பண்ணினேன்; உலாவுகிறது, *to walk about*, உலாவினேன்; தும்முகிறது, *to sneeze often*, தும்மினேன்; பின்னுகிறது, *to interweave*, பின்னினேன். From these except only ஊனுகிறது, *to prepare*, which has ஊன்றேன்: of the other this rule is pretty universal.

2. But if that *u* there be joined க, or ட, or ற; then whether more than one syllable precede, as, முடுகுகிறது, திருடுகிறது, தவறுகிறது; or only one syllable precedes, that however being long, either by its own nature, as, ஏகுகிறது, தேடுகிறது, தேறுகிறது; or long because two consonants follow, as தக்குகிறது, அண்டுகிறது, கட்டுகிறது, கன்றுகிறது, சுற்றுகிறது, &C., in all these cases the praeterite ends in the same way in இனேன். Thus முடுக்கினேன், திருடினேன், தவறினேன், ஏகினேன், தேடினேன் தேறினேன், தக்கினேன், அண்டினேன், கட்டினேன், கன்றினேன், சுற்றினேன், & C. Except போடுகிறது, of which, although the first syllable is long, the praeterite is போட்டேன், But if before கு, டு, று, there be only one short syllable, then

that consonant, க, ட, ற, being doubled, the praeterite ends in ஏன். Thus from தகுகிறது, தக்கேன்: from நகு கிறது, நக்கேன்; from படுகிறது, பட்டேன், பெறுகிறது, பெற்றேன், இருகிறது, இற்றேன்; அறுகிறது, அற்றேன், & C. This rule also is invariable: neverthless மிகுகிறது, and புகுகிறது, besides மிக்கேன் and புக்கேன், have also மிகுந்தேன் and புகுந்தேன்,

61. Rule 3. ளு, ரு, லு, demand for themselves severally டேன், தேன், றேன்: ழு varies. This is an exception from these, which have *u* before கிறது. That is to say.

1. If there be joined to that *u* a single ள, it becomes in the praeterite ண்டேன். Thus ஆளுகிறது, ஆண்டேன், மாளுகிறது, மாண்டேன், உருளுகிறது, உருண்டேன், வெருளு கிறது, வெருண்டேன், & C. அருளுகிறது, however, has அருளினேன் But if the ள be double, the praeterite, by the general rule, is in இனேன்; thus தள்ளுகிறது, தள்ளி னேன்; துள்ளுகிறது, துள்ளினேன்; அள்ளுகிறது, அள்ளினேன்; & C. Neverthless விள்ளுகிறது, besides விள்ளினேன், has also விண்டேன்: and கொள்ளுகிறது always has கொண்டேன்.

2. If that *u*, ர be joined, ந்தேன் is added in the praeterite to that consonant ர், which is allowed to remain: thus வளர்கிறது, வளர்ந்தேன்; தீருகிறது, தீர்ந்தேன்; சேரு, கிறது, சேர்ந்தேன்; தவிருகிறது, தவிர்ந்தேன் &C. Except one or two having *inen*: thus வாருகிறது, வாரினேன். But வருகிறது, வந்தேன்; தருகிறது, தந்தேன்; and பொருகிறது, பொருந்தேன்.

3. But if to that there be joined ல, either single, as சுழலுகிறது, அழலுகிறது; or double, as செல்லு, செல்லுகிறது, வெல்லுகிறது, கொல்லுகிறது, &c.: then the ல is taken away altogether, and ன்றேன் is added: thus சுழன்றேன், அழன்றேன், சென்றேன், வென்றேன், கொன்றேன், &c. So when நிற்கிறது occurs by sincope from நில்லுகிறது, this, both in the imperative has நில்லு, and in the negative நில்லேன்: and by this rule in the praeterite it has நின்றேன். Except however சொல்லுகிறது, which has சொன்னேன்.

4. Finally "ழு *varies*". That is to say, if to that *u*, ம be joined, some in the praeterite add simply தேன்: thus அழுகிறது, அழுதேன்; உழுகிறது, உழுதேன்; தொழுகிறது, தொழுதேன், Others, reject the *u* and add ழ் to the consonant ந்தேன்: thus from வாழுகிறது, வாழ்ந்தேன்; from தாழுகிறது, தாழ்ந்தேன்; உமிழுகிறது, உமிழ்ந்தேன்; அவிழுகிறது, அவிழ்ந்தேன்; தவழுகிறது, தவழ்ந்தேன்: விழுகிறது however retains the *u* also, and makes விழுந்தேன். But முழுகிறது has indeed முழுகினேன், but it does not belong to this rule; since is is really முழுகுகிறது; whence it has in the Infinitive முழுக, and not முழ, as the others here adduced, have, அழ, உழ, வாழ, உமிழ.

62. Rule 4 ய்,இ,ஐ *give* ந்தேன்: that is to say, if the consonant ய, or *i*, or *ai*, occurs before கிறது, கறது is rejected, and the praeterite formed by adding ந்தேன்: thus from அடைகிறது, அடைந்தேன்; So from கடைகிறது, கடைந்தேன்: So from அறிகிறது, அறிந்தேன், &c. Except

வைகிறது, which has வைத்தேன்; பெய்கிறது, பெய்தேன்; செய்கிறது, செய்தேன்; நெய்கிறது, நெய்தேன்: to which, except sometimes by the very lowest people, ந் is usually added.

63. Finally Rule 5. *"long syllablesvary:"* that is to say, when before *கிறது,* there occurs a long vowel, (which very few verbs admit), the rule is variable. For instance அகிறது, and போறது which really is போகிறது. have ஆனேன், போனேன் சாகிறது, செற்றேன் with the first short: வேகிறது, நோகிறது have வெந்தேன், நொந்தேன், in which, the first syllable, which elsewhere is always long, becomes short in the praeterite, and in consequence in the gerund and past participle also.

64. The form of the praeterite being given by these rules, this also is conjugated through the persons and numbers according to the endings given at number 52. Thus from the verb செய்கிறது *to make,* the Praeterite is:

PRAETERITE TENSE

Singular.

Ist Person	செய்-தேன்,	*I have made.*
2nd	செய்-தாய்,	*Thou hast made.*
3rd Masculine	செய்-தான்,	*He has made.*
,, Feminine	செய்-தாள்,	*She has made.*
,, Neuter	செய்-தது,	*It has made.*
	Honorary.	
Ist	செய்-தோம்,	*I have made.*
2nd	செய்-தீர்,	*Thou hast made.*
3rd	செய்-தார்,	*He or she has made*

Plural.

1st	செய்-தோம்,	*We have made.*
2nd	செய்-தீர்கள்,	*You have made.*
3rd M. and F.	செய்-தார்கள்,	*They have made.*
" N.	செய்-தது,	*They have made.*

I have said செய்தது for the Neuter, although others may say செய்தது: which however is barbarous and vulgar. Besides, of these which I have said have ந்தேன் in the praeterite, some may terminate in ஞ்சேன்; and those which have த்தேன், may have ச்சேன். Not all however, but those only which have இ or ஐ before க்கிறது or கிறது: thus அறிகிறது, அறிந்தேன் or அறிஞ்சேன்; படிக்கிறது, படித்தேன் or படிச்சேன்; so மறைகிறது, மறைந்தேன் or மறைஞ்சேன்; அடைக்கிறது, அடைத்தேன் or அடைச்சேன். &c. But this way is not so elegant; certainly in so many of their classical books which I have read, written not only in verse, but in prose also, I have undoubtedly nowhere once met with ஞ்சேன் or ச்சேன்; but they always form the praeterite in verbs of that sort in ந்தேன் or த்தேன். Moreover of those which have another letter besides இ or ஐ before கிறது or க்கிறது never can even one verb have the praeterite in ஞ்சேன்; although they may have ந்தேன் or த்தேன். So it can by no means be said மறஞ்சேன், வளர்ஞ்சேன், பொறுஞ்சேன், படுச்சேன், &c. Wherefore ந்தேன், த்தேன் is the universal mode in all verbs of that rule, without exception; and is certainly more elegant, and is with one consent approved and used by the learned.

65. I add a nappendix for the third person of the neuter. All verbs which have the praeterite in இனேன், besides having in the third person neuter இனது; as அடங்கினது, பண்ணினது &c. elegantly have also இற்று: thus அடங்கிற்று, பண்ணிற்று &c. So, in the elegant dialect, from சொல்லுகிறது. comes the praeterite சொல்லினேன். Al-though we do not use this in the vulgar dialect, we use nevertheless, according to this rule, the third person neuter சொல்லிற்று. some in plase of double ற, add double ச, and say அடங்கிச்சு, பண்ணிச்சு, சொல்லிச்சு, &c which however is not so elegant. Others to bolh ways add து, சொல்லிச்சுது or சொல்லிற்றுது; which however is altogether a mistake Others finally use this termination in other praterites also; and inslead of saying அது வந்தது, hey say அது வந்திச்சு. &c as generaliy men of the lowest, caste of Parrears are accustomed to speak. Which however must by no means be said. According to this rule, the third person neuier varies in the praeterite, ஆனேன் from ஆகிறது, and போனேன் from போறது: for it either becomes according to their general rule ஆனது, போனது; or, since the praeterite may be ஆயினேன்,போயினேன், according to this appendix, it becomes ஆயிற்று, போயிற்று: which however aithough it be common in the high idiom, is not in use in the vulgar dialect; but they usethese words, ஆச்சு or ஆச்சுது, போச்சு or போச்சுது, Andthus much of the praeterites.

Section III

Of the Future.

66. About the Future there is almost no difficulty. Forasmuch as,

1. All that have கினேன், with single or double க, in the praeterite, have in the future குவேன். Thus முடுகினேன், *to cast out*, முடுகுவேன்; வணங்கினேன், *to venerate*, வணங்குவேன்; அடக்கினேன், *to shut in*, அடக்குவேன், &c.

2. These being excepted, no other form of praeterite being taken into account, those which end in க்கிறது have the future in ப்பேன்: thus from படிக்கிறது, *to learn*, படிப்பேன்; from மறக்கிறது, *to forget*, மறப்பேன்; from இருக்கிறது, *to exist*, இருப்பேன்; from கேள்க்கிறது, *to hear*, கேள்ப்பேன், or which is the same thing கேட்பேன், & C.

Those however which end in கிறது, have in the future வேன்: thus செய்கிறது, *to make*, செய்வேன்; ஆகிறது, *to become*, ஆவேன்; போகிறது, *to go*, போவேன்; பெறுகிறது, *to obtain*, பெறுவேன்; எழுதுகிறது, *to write*, எழுதுவேன், &c. Except those, which before கிறது, have the consonant ண் or ன்; these add பேன்; thus உண்கிறது, *to eat*, உண்பேன்; காண்கிறது, *to see*, காண்பேன்; So தின்கிறது, *to eat*, தின்பேன்; என்கிறது, *to Say*, என்பேன், & c. Moreover those which have லு, ழு, ளு, either with the double consonant, or with a long letter preceding, before கிறது; these more elegantly add வேன் according to the general rule, the single consonant remaining: thus from சொல்லுகிறது, *to say*, சொல்லுவேன் or சொல்வேன்; from

கொள்ளுகிறது, *to buy*, கொள்ளுவேன் or கொள்வேன்; from ஆளுகிறது, *to reign*, ஆளுவேன் or ஆள்வேன்; from வாழுகிறது, *to live*, வாழுவேன் or வாழ்வேன், & c. Of these futures the second is always the more elegant. But அழுகிறது *e.g.* since it has not a consonant, nor a long but a short vowel before ழ, cannot be called அழ்வேன், but must always be called அழுவேன், &c.

The form of the future having been easily found by means of these rules, this tense may also be conjugated through the persons and numbers according to the common terminations: thus,

FUTURE TENSE.

Singular

1st Person	செய்-வேன்,	*I shall or will make.*
2nd	செய்-வாய்,	*Thou shalt or wilt make*
3rd Masc.	செய்-வான்,	*He shall or will make.*
,, Fem.	செய்-வாள்,	*She shall or will make.*
,, Neut.	செய்-யும்,	*It shall or will make*

Honorary.

1st	செய்-வோம்	*I shall or will make.*
2nd	செய்-வீர்,	*Thou shalt or will make.*
3rd	செய்-வார்,	*He or she shall or will make.*

Plural

1st	செய்-வோம்,	*We shall or will make.*
2nd	செய்-வீர்கள்,	*You shall or will make.*
3rd M. & F.	செய்-வார்கள்,	*They shall or will make.*
,, N.	செய்-யும்,	*They shall or will make.*

67. Here observe that for the third person neuter. verbs that end in க்கிறது change this into க்கும்: thus அடக்கிறது, *to include*, அடக்கும்; இருக்கிறது, *to exist*, இருக்கும்; படைக்கிறது, *to create*, படைக்கும், &c. Those however which end in கிறது, rejecting altogether கிறது, add உம், in this way. If the vowel preceding be *u*, it is struck out: thus அழுகிறது, *to weep*, அழும்; ஆளுகிறது, *to govern*, ஆளும்; பெறுகிறது, *to be in health*, பெறும், &c. But if it be some other short vowel, or the dipthong ஐ, ய is inserted and it becomes யும்: thus அடைகிறது, *to obtain*, அடையும் அறிகிறது, *to know*, அறியும், &c. But if the vowel be long, then either a single ம் is added, or கும் is added: thus from ஆகிறது *to be made*, comes ஆம் or ஆகும்; from போறது, *to go*, போம் or போகும்; from வேகிறது, *to burn*, வேம் or வேகும்; from நோகிறது, *to grieve*, நோம் or நோகும், &c. Finally if there be a consonant before கிறது, உம் is united to it, by doubling that consonant, if it be preceded by a short vowel; but otherwise, if by a long one: thus, தின்கிறது, *to eat*, தின்னும்; செய்கிறது, *to make*, செய்யும்; மேய்கிறது, *to feed*, மேயும், &c. Those however which have குவேன் in the Ist person, as I have stated above, always have கும் in the third of the neuter: வணங்குவேன், வணங்கும்; அடங்குவேன், அடங்கும், &c.

Since, besides, these three tenses, the Tamulians have no Imperfect, nor Pluperfect, I will explain the mode of supplying those, in the following chapter, where I shall treat of the Syntax; there too I shall give certain phrases, which we may call Aorists.

Section IV

Of the Imperative

68. The Tamulians have the Imperative, and call it ஏவல், from the verb ஏவுகிறது *to command.* The rule for the Imperative however is easy; for as much as the word which remains, after rejecting from any verb, க்கிறது, or கிறது, serves for the Imperative, in the second person singular. Thus from படிக்கிறது, படி; from பொறுக்கிறது, பொறு; from பார்க்கிறது, பார்: so from சொல்லுகிறது, சொல்லு; from செய்கிறது, செய்; from போறது, போ, &c Thus, since நிற்கிறது and விற்கிறது, are so pronounced by syncope, from நில்லுகிறது and வில்லுகிறது, which are not in use; the imperative according to this rule is in use notwithstanding; நில்லு, வில்லு. Those however which before கிறது or க்கிறது have the consonants ன or ழ, add *u;* thus தின்கிறது, தின்னு; என்கிறது, என்னு; அவிழ்க்கிறது, அவிழு, &c. Those however which have லு, or ளு, or ழு with a long vowel preceding, or with double ல or ள, may may also terminate with the simple consonant ல, ள, ழ: thus from கோலுகிறது, with the first long, *to inflect,* comes கோலு, or கோல்; from சொல்லுகிறது, சொல்லு or சொல்; from ஆளுகிறது, ஆளு or ஆள்; from கொள்ளுகிறது, கொள்ளு or கொள்; from வாழுகிறது, வாழு or வாழ், &c., and the second way is always the more elegant.

From the general rule except those which in the praeterite have க்னேன்; for in the imperative, they have கு: thus வாங்கினேன், வாங்கு; அடக்கினேன், அடக்கு; முடுகி

னேன், முடுகு, &c. Which however are not in fact to be excepted; forasmuch as I have repeatedly said, since these verbs are really அடக்குகிறது, முடுகுகிறது, &c. they have the Imperative according to the general rule.

Except however வருகிறது, and தருகிறது; for from these come, வா, *vā* தா, *dā*: and these for the second person have நீய் *tu*.

69. But for the second person Honorary உம் is added: thus படியும், சொல்லும்; அவிழும், வாங்கும், &c. But to the Imperative போ, *depart thou*, they do not add உம், but ம் only for the honorary; and say போம். And to the words வா, தா, they add ரும் and say வாரும், தாரும். Moreover, if there still be added to this word of the imperative, கொள் short, it becomes the second person plural: thus படியுங்கொள், சொல்லுங்கொள், போங்கொள், வாருங்கொள், தாருங்கொள், &c. For the other persons they use the word of the future tense. Again an elegant form of the imperative, in all the persons, is to use the word of the Infinitive, *e.g.*, இருக்க, போக, சொல்ல, &c. And they use this method especially when they speak with a highly noble personage, with a king, a priest &c., to whom they would not seem to speak imperatively: they do not say, *e.g.*, தேவரீரெழுந்திரும்; but, as if asking, தேவரீரெழுந்திருக்க; and so not கேளும், but, கேள்க்க, &c. In this sense they often add உம் to the word of the Infinitive; வரவும், கேட்கவும், &c. Hence another mode of Imperative is to add to each person of the Future, ஆக, the Infinitive from the verb ஆகிறது: thus போவாயாக, போவீராக,

போவானாக, &c. Which however is not strictly imperative, as we have said: because they use the word of the Infinitive with any person, as I shall explain more at large in the more elegant dialect of this language. Wherefore from the verb செய்கிறது the Imperative is:

Inperative

Singular

2nd Person	செய், or செய்-வாயாக,	*Make thou.*
rd Masc.	செய்-வானாக,	*Let him make.*
,, Fem.	செய்-வாளாக,	*Let her make.*

Honorary

2nd	செய்-யும், or செய்-வீராக,	*Make thou.*

Plural

2nd	செய்-யுங்கொள், or செய்-வீர்களாக,	*Make ye.*
3rd	செய்-வார்களாக,	*Let them make.*

and for any person செய்-ய, செய்-யவும்.

The Tamulians have, properly speaking, no Optative or Subjunctive; although they express these ideas very well by certain phrases; which, since they have reference to the Syntax; I shall treat of in the next chapter.

Section V.

Of the Infinitive.

70. The Infinitive in this language is exceedingly easy: since all verbs which end in க்கிறது, from the Infinitive by changing that into க்க: thus, from படிக்கிறது, படிக்க; from இருக்கிறது, இருக்க; from அடக்கிறது, அடக்க; from பொறுக்கிறது, பொறுக்க; from மறக்கிறது, மறக்க, &c. The Rule is quite universal. Those however which end in கிறது, may all indeed in the same way have the Infinitive in க: thus from அறிகிறது, அறிக; from செய்கிறது, செய்க, &c. Still this mode more properly belongs to the high dialect, and is seldom adopted in the vulgar; except in verbs which have a long syllable before கிறது: for even in the vulgar dialect there occur ஆக, போக, வேக, நோக, &c. Others, rejecting கிறது, add *a* short, which is joined to the word which remains; so that if this ends in *u*, it may be struck out: thus from பெறுகிறது, பெற; from அழுகிறது, அழ, &c. If it ends in ஐ or இ, ய may be added; thus from அடைகிறது, அடைய; from அறிகிறது, அறிய, &c. If, finally, it ends in a consonant, then, unless it be ர or ழ, which never are doubled, and one only syllable and that short precedes, that consonan is doubled; but not so if either more syllables precede, or one long one. Thus from உண்கிறது, since the first syllable is short, comes உண்ண; but from காண்கிறது, since the first is long, comes காண; so from செய்கிறது, செய்ய; but

from மேய்கிறது, மேய: so from தின்கிறது, தின்ன; from என் கிறது, என்ன, &c. All these Rules are universal. Hence, as I have very often said, since those which in the praeterite have கினேன், may in fact end in க்கிறது, although by syncope the கு is taken away; they have க in the Infinitive according to this general rule; வணங்க, முடுக, முழுக, &c.

SECTION—IV

Of Gerunds and Participles

71. The Tamulians call the Gerund வினையெச்சம், as if the would call it, *a defect of the verb*: for the Gerund has the force and meaning of a verb, but since it is not conjugated through the persons and tenses, it is said to fall short somewhat of the design of the verb. They have one only gerund, which is equivalent to our gerend in *do*: They supply others in a way which I shall explain at number 121, where I treat of the Syntax. The Gerund however, which they have, is taken from the word of the praeterite in this way: if this ends in இனேன், னேன் being taken away, we have the gerund in *i*; வணங்கினேன், வணங்கி; அடக்கினேன், அடக்கி; வாரினேன், வாரி முடுகினேன், முடுகி; பண்ணினேன், பண்ணி, & C. Thus, since சொல்லுகிறது, as we have said above, may have for this praeterite in the high dialect சொல்லினேன்; although its praeterite is not in use in the vulgar dialect also, yet the Gerund from this is in use சொல்லி. All others remove ஏன் from the praeterite and substitute *u*, to form the gerund. thus from வந்தேன், வந்து; from அறிந்தேன், அறிந்து; from படித்தேன், படித்து; from பட்டேன், பட்டு; from பெற்றேன், பெற்று; from உண்டேன், உண்டு; from என்றேன். என்று, & C Except ஆனேன், போனேன், which have ஆகி, போகி, or more frequently ஆய் and போய். Observe this one thing, that this gerund can never be governed by another noun than that which governs the following verb; which

verb may not be another gerund, but either the principal verb completing the sentence, or an infinitive, or a participle, &C.: which is observed by the Latins, in respect of the gerund in *do*. Thus I cannot say, அவன் பாடி நானாடினேன், because the gerund பாடி is governed by அவன், and the following ஆடினேன் by நான். So neither in Latin may I say, *ille cantando, ego saltavi, (he by singing, I danced:)* but by the ablative absolute, *illo cantante, him singing;* whence also in Tamul we must say அவன் பாட நானாடினேன். But it is correct to say, நான் பாடி யாடினேன், *ego cantando saltavi, by singing I danced.* So it is said, நான் சொல்லிக்கொண்டு வந்த காரியமவன் செய்தான்; because although the Gerunds, சொல்லி, கொண்டு, may be governed by நான், and the principal verb செய்தான் by அவன்; yet there follows after the Gerunds the participle வந்த, which is governed by the same நான், & C. This Rule is to be especially observed; for in this I have seen even the more expert make mistakes. Hence without error it cannot be said, கர்த்தர் பிறந்து சுளாஉஅ ௵, *the 1728th year from the birth of Christ;* but either பிறந்த, or பிறந்தது: and so in other cases. Except however the Gerund ஆய், from the verb ஆகிறது; which since it often serves to form adverbs from nouns, as I shall explain at Number 125, does not then follow this rule.

72. But they call the Participle, பெயரெச்சம், *a defect of the noum:* for it has the signification of a noun, but with the Tamulians is not declined through the cases, genders and numbers, but the very same one word of the participle serves for every case, gender, and number; whence

they say well, that it falls short of the design of the noun. There are three participles, of the present, of the praeterite or past, and of the future.

The Participle of the Present, is formed by taking away து from கிறது or க்கிறது: thus from ஆகிறது, ஆகிற; from செய்கிறது, செய்கிற; from போறது, போற; & C. So from படிக்கிறது, படிக்கிற; from அடக்கிறது, அடக்கிற; & C.

The Participle of the Praeterite, is formed by taking away ஏன் from the word of the praeterite, and adding a short: thus from ஆனேன், ஆன; from போனேன், போன; from பட்டேன், பட்ட; from பெற்றேன், பெற்ற; from படித்தேன், படித்த; from வணங்கினேன், வணங்கின; & C.

The Participle of the Future is the very word of the third person neuter: ஆம், or ஆகும்; போம், or போகும்; செய்யும், இருக்கும், படிக்கும், அழும், ஆளும், & C.

73. Observe that the two first participles correspond with ours; not so the participle future: forasmuch as செய்யும் *e.g.* serves only for the participle *facturus*, *about to make*, when this can be resolved by who or which, and the word of the future tense, I will make, thou wilt make, & c. Thus I may translate இதைச் செய்யுந் தச்சன், &c., *the artificer about to make this*, or *the artificer who is about to make this, i.e. who will make this*. But when the participle in *rus* in Latin implies an *end*, then it can be resolved neither by *who* or *which*, nor by this participle of the Tamul Language: *e.g*, *Dominus bonis praemium daturus*

venlet, the Lord will come to give a reward to the good, cannot well be translated by the Tamul words, நல்லவர் களுக்குப் பலனைத்தரு மாண்டவர் வருவார்; for this proposition will correspond with this, *The Lord, who will give a reward to the good, will come,* which differs much from the first. Wherefore this participle of the future only supplies the the duty discharged by the relative, *who* or *which,* which this language wants: thus, *at the time, in which I will do,* செய்யும்போது; so, *the parrot which I will say this,* இதைச் சொல்லுங் கிளி, & C. But they often also use this participle, elegantly, for the participle of the present: thus instead of saying எனக்கிருக்கிற கஸ்தி, they say, எனக்கிருக்குங் கஸ்தி; *the pain which I have;* so instead of saying நீய் செய்கிற வேலை, they say, நீய் செய்யும் வேலை, *the work which you are doing, & C* But the modes which truly correspond with our participle future in *rus* and in *dus,* I shall explain at number 123, in the next chapter, on Syntax.

SECTION VII.

Of the Negative Verb

74. It is peculiar to this language, to have a mode, whereby, without any particle importing negation, they express the negative sense of every verb. The Tamulians call *negation* எதிர்மறை மொழி. The verb Negative is formed in this way. ஏன் long is added to the word of the Imperative; and if that word ends in *u*, it is always struck out: if in another vowel, ய or வ interpsed, according to the rule at Number 14: but if it is ends in a consonant with a short vowel preceding, that consonant is doubled, and to it ஏன் is united: thus பொறு, *sustain,* பொறேன்: நில்லு, *stand,* நில்லேன்; துடை, *wipe off,* துடையேன்; வணங்கு, *venerate* வணங்கேன்; அடக்கு, *include,* அடக்கேன்; நட, *walk about,* நடவேன்; படி, *learn,* படியேன்; உண்ணு, *eat,* உண்ணேன்; சொல்லு, *say,* சொல்லேன்; காண், *see,* காணேன்; செய், *make,* செய்யேன்; மேய், *feed,* மேயேன், & C. Except only those which before கிறது have a long vowel; these form the negative in கேன்; thus ஆகிறது, *to become,* ஆகேன்; போறது, which really is போகிறது, *to go,* போகேன்; வேகிறது, *to burn,* வேகேன்; நோகிறது, *to grieve,* நோகேன்; சாகிறது, *to die,* சாகேன், &C. This form being given, the verb Nagative is conjugated, as the positive; only in the third person neuter it has ādu: *e g.* ஆகாது, சொல்லாது: or even, the து being thrown away; it makes ஆகா, சொல்லா, &C. The negative then from செய்கிறது is this:

Singular.

1st Person	செய்-யேன்,	*I will not make.*
2nd	செய்-யாய்,	*Thou wilt not make.*
3rd Masc.	செய்-யான்	*He will not make.*
„ Fem.	செய்-யாள்,	*She will not make.*
„ Neut.	செய்-யாது,	*It will not make.*
„	செய்யார்,	

Honorary.

1st	செய்-யோம்,	*I will not make.*
2nd	செய்-யீர்,	*Thou wilt not make.*
3rd	செய்-யார்,	*He will not make.*

Plural.

1st	செய்-யோம்,	*We will note make.*
2nd	செய்-யீர்கள்,	*You will not make.*
3rd M. and F.	செய்-யார்கள்,	*They will not make.*
„ N.	செய்-யாது,	*They will not make.*
„	செய்-யாரி,	

75. This Negative is properly put for the future; they use it also however for the praeterite, but that which implies habit; and it is well explained by the verb *I am not accustomed*: thus, முன்னுந் திருடே னினியுந் திருடேன், *I have neither been accustomed to steal before, nor will I steal in future*. So, if you should ask, *have you committed this sin?* and the person should answer, செய்யேன், it means, *I am not accustomed to commit it.* In the same way they use also the word of the future positive for the praeterite tense, in order that they may signify habitual continuance, *I am*

accustomed, &c. Thus if, to that question from the praeterite, *have you committed this sin,* he should answer by the future, செய்வேன்; it means, not simply *I have committed it,* but, I *am accustomed to commit it &c.*

Besides this tense they have an Imperative Negative. ths form of which is taken from the third person neuter, by changing *u* into ē: from செய்யாது comes செய்யாதே, *do not thou make, &c.*: to which if யும் be added, you have the form of the imperative honorary, செய்யாதேயும், &c. To which if you yet add கோள், you have the second person plural, செய்யாதேயுங்கோள், &c.

They have also a negative Gerund, and its form is the same word of the third person of the neuter gender, செய் யாது; to which they often add ē and say, c.g. ஒன்றுஞ் செய்யாதே போனான், *he departed with doing nothing,* or throwing away து they add மல், செய்யாமல், *with not doing, & c.*

They have also a Participle, whose form comes from the third person neuter itself, the து being either altogether taken away, or changed into த: செய்யா or செய்யாத. The first of these doubles க, ச, த, ப if they follow it, as in its prope placer we have stated; thus, செய் யாக் காரியம் or செய்யாத காரியம், &c. Which Participle signifies, not only, what is not being done, or has not been done: but also, what is not to be done; செய்யாததைச் செய்தான், *he has done what was not to be done.*

Imperative Negative

Sing.	செய்-யாதே,	*Do not thou make.*
Hon.	செய்-யாதேயும்	*Do not thou make.*
Plur.	செய்-யாதேயுங்கோள்,	*Do not ye make.*

Nagative Gerund.

செய்-யாது, செய்-யாமல்	*In not making.*

Negative Participle

செய்-யா, செய்-யாத,	*Not making.*

76. The Tamulians use this negative in another way; forasmuch as they join the negative gerund to the verb இருக்கிறது, and then the signification is received from the gerund; the persons the number and the tense are taken from the verb இருக்கிறது, which is conjugated in the common way. Thus

செய்யா-திருக்கிறேன்,	*I do not make.*
செய்யா-திருந்தேன்,	*I have not made.*
செய்யா-திருப்பேன்,	*I will not make.*
செய்யா-திரேன்,	*I will not cease to make.*
செய்யா-திரு,	*Thou mayest not make.*
செய்யா-திருக்க,	*Not to make.*

And in this mode, the negative gerund not being changed, the verb இருக்கிறது is conjugated through the Persons, Numbers and Tenses.

Finally, like the Latins, they sometimes add to a positive verb, a negative particle, இல்லை, of which I will speak below: thus செய்கிறேனில்லை, *I do not make*; செய்தேனில்லை, *I have not made*; செய்வேனில்லை, *I will not make*, &c. Or they add negation இல்லை, either to the word of the Infinitive, *e g*. செய்யவில்லை, for every tense, person and number: or even add that to the verbal formed the participles; e g. செய்கிறதில்லை, செய்ததில்லை, செய்வதில்லை, which serve in the three tenses for every person and number.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Passive Voice

77. In this language there are no verbs, which in truth, to themselves, are Passive: but they all become passive by adding the verb படுகிறது, which means, *to suffer*. Those which, by Another person, are called passives, *e.g.*, முகிகிறது, வளருகிறது, விளங்கிறது, &c. are not to be called passive, but neuter; for they do not express passion or suffering from a cause, but import an intransitive sense, *e.g.* வளர்க்கிறது, means, *to increase*, actively; is there any வளருகிறது, that will mean *to be increased*, passively? certainly not, but it means to *grow larger*, a neuter verb. Thus it is said, உன் மகன் வளர்ந்தான், *your son has increased in size*: and to express, *to be increased*, we must say வளர்க்கப்படுகிறது. So முகிகிறது does not mean *to be completed*, passively; but *to cease*, *to leave off*, neuter. So I may properly say பெய்ய முகிந்தது, *it has ceased to rain*: but if I would say, *this has been completed by me*, I must say, என்னாலிது முகிக்கப்பட்டது. To make this appear yet more clearly; the Latin have *luceo, I shine*, neuter; *illumino, I illumine*, active; *illuminor, I am enlightened*, passive. To these correspond விளங்கிறது, neuter; விளக்கிறது, active; விளக்கப்படுகிறது, passive. Whence I may correctly say, சந்திரன் லோகத்தை விளக்கும், *the moon illumines the world*, and சந்திரன் சூரியனால் விளக்கப்படும், *the moon is illumined by the sun*; and finally, simply, சந்திரன் விளங்கும், *the moon shines*; and surely I may not render this phrase in Latin by this, *luna illuminatur, the moon is illumined;*

which however might be done if விளங்கிறது were passive. I can indeed add சூரியனால் விளங்கும், *it shines from the sun*; nor can on that account either *luceo, I shine*, or விளங்குகிறது, be called verbs passive. But since there may be very many verbs of this kind in this language, I have wished to explain it the more fully, in order to mark what they really signify.

But the Tamulians very often use the verb active in a passive sense: thus சொன்னது போதும், *it suffices, what has been said, &c.* Which happens especially in participles, when a nominative is not joined to them: thus, சொன்ன சூத்திரம், *the rule mentioned;* அறிந்த ஞாயம், *the known method;* செய்த வேலை, *the work done*. Nevertheless it would be better to add the verb படுகிறது, and to say சொல்லப்பட்ட, அறியப்பட்ட, செய்யப்பட்ட.

78. All verbs, then, become passive, as I have stated, by the means of the verb படுகிறது, *to suffer*, which is added to the Infinitive of every verb; so that, without altering the form of the Infinitive, the verb படுகிறது may be conjugated through the persons, numbers and tenses: thus அறியப்படுகிறேன், அறியப்பட்டேன், அறியப்படுவேன், அறியப்படு, அறியப்பட்டு, அறியப்படுகிற-பட்ட-படும், அறியப்பட, அறியப்படேன், &c. The same is done, by adding, as they are sometimes wont to do, the verb பெறுகிறது, to the Infinitive, which besides other meanings, signifies *to merit, to obtain*: thus அறியப்பெற்ற காரியம் *a thing known*, that is, which *deserves*, which *has obtained* to be known, &c. Finally, the Tamulians

use, sometimes, but rarely, the verb உண்கிறது, with some verbals, in a passive sense. Thus from அறைகிறது, which means *to affix,* they say அறையுண்டேன்,-யுண்டாய்,-யுண்டான், &c., *I have been affixed, thou hast been, &c. he, she or it has been, &c.* So from படைப்பு, a verbal from the verb படைக்கிறது *to create,* they say படைப்புண்டேன், &c. *I have been created, &c*

SECTION IX

Of Defective Verbs

79. In this language and in the vulgar dialect especially, there are very many Defective verbs, of which I will adduce a few, which are more necessary for use.

And I, ஒக்கும் with *o short,* signifies *it is equal,* and requires either a dative, or accusative, or the ablative ஒடு: thus அதுக்கொக்குமிது, or அதையொக்குமிது, or அதிதோடொக்குமிது, *this is equal to that.* This verb entirely wants the present; but in the praeterite it has all the persons according to the rule: *ஒத்தேன், ஒத்தாய், ஒத்தான்,* &c. In the Future it has all the words according also to the common rule: ஒப்பேன், ஒப்பாய், &c., and the third neuter is the above mentioned ஒக்கும். It has the Infinitive *ஒக்க, to be equal;* whick, like more infinitives, as I shall explain in its own place, is often taken adverbially, and signifies *equally, together*: thus *ஒக்க வந்தேன், I have come together.* It has the Gerund *ஒத்து*, from which comes *ஒத்துக்கொள்ளுகிறது, to agree together,* as if I should say, to receive anything in a uniform sense. Hence, by uniting the verb *இருக்கிறது* to this gerund, this, being carried through the several person, numbers, and tenses, supplies the defect of this defective verb: thus, *ஒத்திருக்கிறேன், ஒத்திருந்தேன், ஒத்திருப்பேன், ஒத்திரு, ஒத்திரேன்,* &c. It has the Past Participle, *ஒத்த*; hence இப்படிக்கொத்த is the dative of the noun *படி*, *a mode,* the particle இ for the article *இந்த,* and the said participle; and thus

I might say இந்தப்படிக்கு ஒத்த, that is, *like to this mode;* and it may be well explained by the one word, *hujusmodi, such.* It has moreover the Negative, ஒவ்வேன், &c from the genral rule: but a double வ் is added, since the first syllable is short, (which must be carefully observed, for if the first be pronounced long, it has a very shameful signification). Hence it has the negative Gerund, as other verbs, ஒவ்வாது, or ஒவ்வாமல்; and the negative Participle, ஒவ்வாத. Finally it has the Verbal in பு, as nearly all that end in க்கிறது, add is is ஒப்பு, *similitude*: இவனுக் கொப்பில்லை, *he has no similitude, &c.* I might more shortly say, that this verb wants only the present tense and the imperative mood; I have wished however to set forth all its words more fully, because Another, with I know not what injustice, has given to this vere these three words only, ஒக்கும், ஒவ்வாது, ஒவ்வாத; and nevertheless, all those which I have adduced above, are common in the mouths of all.

80. 2. வேணும் is the word of the third person neuter of the future, from the verb வேண்டுகிறது; whence in the more elegant idiom it is pronounced, not வேணும், but வேண்டும், the ட being retained; which, even in the vulgar dialect, is retained in other words which belong to this verb. This verb signifies both *to pray*, and *to be required, to be necessary*: hence வேணும், according to the second signification, is, *it is required, it is necessary*; forasmuch as they everywhere use the word of tne future for the present; whence what is required and is necessary

well comes in the nominative; but for whom it is required, in the dative Thus இதெனக்கு வேணும், *this. this is necessary for me,* or *this is required for me; by me,* being understood. Whence it is well rendered, though not to the letter, *I wish this.* In the vulgar dialect, besides this word, it has the third person of the praeterite, வேண்டினது or வேண்டிற்று: it has the gerund வேண்டி; it has the participle of the praeterite, வேண்டின or வேண்டிய; it has the participle future and it is, as usual, the third person neuter of the future, வேணும், which, as others, it also substitutes for the present; thus எனக்கு வேணும் பொருள், *the thing, which I wish,* or *which is necessary to me.* It has the Negative in the third person neuter only, according to the general rule. வேண்டாது or வேண்டா. A custom prevails in the barbarous vulgar idiom of adding ம, and they say வேண்டாம், *it is not required, it is not necessary, I do not wish it.* The Negative gerund is வேண்டாது, and the participle வேண்டாத. When however வேண்டுகிறது signifies to pray, it is in no way defective.

81. 3. மாட்டேன் is the first person negative from the verb மாட்டுகிறது. *to be able,* which they use in the future only: மாட்டுவேன் *I shall be able,* மாட்டுவாய், *thow will be able, &c.* Hence மாட்டேன் means, *I am not able,* and Is conjugated through all the persons, மாட்டாய், மாட்டான், மாட்டாது &c. Hence the same மாட்டாது or மாட்டாமல், is the negative gerund; and மாட்டாத the participle. Moreover மாட்டேன், மாட்டாய், &c. signifies also, *I am unwilling, thou art unwilling,* &c. But it differs much from the word

வேண்டாம், even when this also is explained by *I am unwilling;* so that we may by no means use these two words promiscuously. The difference is this: when the act of not willing, and the action not willed, respect the same subject we use the word மாட்டேன்; but when they have respect to a different subject, we ought to use the word வேண்டாம். Thus, if I wish to say, *I am unwilling to speak;* since the action of speaking and the act of not willing respect me only, I ought to use the word மாட்டேன், நான் பேசமாட்டேன். But if I wish to say, *I am unwilling that you should speak;* since the act of not willing respects me, and the action of speaking, which I do not will, respects another than me, I ought to use the word வேண்டாம்; thus நீய் பேசவேண்டாம். In the same way, If I wish to say, *dost thou not wish to speak?* since the act of not willing, and the action of speaking respect you; it mus the expressed, பேசமாட்டாயோ, But that I may say, *Dost thou not wish me to speak?* since the action of speaking respect me, and the act of not willing respects thee; I may say, நான் பேசவேண்டாமோ. This Rule is to be deligently observed, as exceedingly necessary, and in no case to be varried.

82. 4. The Tamulians, in their Grammar, reckon the word இல்லை, அல்ல, amongst the verbs: each signifies, it is not; with this difference, that the first denies *the existence,* the second. *the essence.* To the first, the contrary is the word, உண்டு, or இருக்கிறது; to the second, the contray is the word, ஆம், or ஆயிருக்கிறது. Whence If

I ask, *is there any rice in the house?* if there is, the answer will be, உண்டு, or இருக்குது: if there is not, it will be இல்லை. But looking at any grain, and inquiring of its essences, I may say, *Is this rice?* if it is not, the answer is, அல்ல; if it is, the answer is, either simply ஆம், or இதரிசி யாயிருக்குது, But these two verbs, இல்லை, அல்ல, besides this word, have the gerund இல்லா, இல்லாது, இல்லாமல்; and அல்ல, அல்லாது, அல்லாமல்: to which if there be added the verb இருக்கிறது, or போறது, they are conjugated through all the persons, numbers and tenses. They have the participle இல்லாத, அல்லாத; for the subjunctive *if,* இல்லாதால், அல்லாதால், and compounded இல்லாதிருந் தால், இல்லாதே போனால், இல்லாவிட்டால், *if it may not be.* This last we use especially in the beginning of a sentence for *otherwise,* & C. Moreover these two words may also be added to an appellative noun derived from participles; *e.g.* இதைச் செய்தவனில்லை, or அவனிதைச் செய்தவனல்ல: The first denies the existence, and is the same as, *there is nobody, who has done this*; the second denies the essence, and is the same as, *he is not the person who has done this,* and prevents the question whether another has done it, or not. But either word without distinction may be added to a verbal of the neuter: நானித்தைச் செய்ததில்லை or செய்ததல்ல, *I have not done this.*

83. 5. உண்டு is a verb defective, which signifies, *it is* importing existence, not essence; and is equivalent to the Latin word *est,* when this is taken in place of the verb *to have*; *e.g.* if I wish to say *I have this,* I may say, *this is*

to me; and so in Tamul, இதெனக்குண்டு; and it is construed as est, with that signification. It has no other word than this, உண்டு, which is used for either number: there is also a participle, உள்ள, with the same signification. It has not a Negative, but to this word is directly opposed negatively the word இல்லை, of which above. Moreover உண்டு is united with the verb ஆகிறது, and makes உண்டாகிறது; and signifies the same thing, *namely, to be,* according as it is taken for *to have,* and then it is conjugated according to the rules of the verb ஆகிறது, Besides, உண்டாகிறது signifies also *to become, to be made,* and if to it be added the active ஆக்கிறது, it also becomes உண்டாக்கிறது, and means *to make, to create.*

84. 6. போதும் is a verb altogether defective: for besides this word, which signifies *it is enough,* it has only the third person of the negative, போதா, or போதாது; the negative gerund போதாது or போதாமல்; and the negative participle போதா or போதாத. In all these words, some put ர in place of த; thus போரும், போராது, & C. The first syllable is always long. This verb is used, *as satis est,* among the Latins: that is to say, the thing, which suffices, is put in the nominative; the person, to whom it suffices, in the dative: இதெனக்குப் போதும், *this is sufficient for me;* இதெனக்குப் போதாது, *this is not sufficient for me.*

85. 7. கடவது: this word which, by Another has been denominated "a certain particle," is in truth a defective verb, which has only all the words of the future; from

which, according to a rule which we shall give in the next chapter, under number 107, comes this verbal, கடவது, which signifies properly, *the duty of doing anything.* But for the future there are these words: கடவேன், *I shall owe,* கடவாய், கடவீர், கடவான், கடவார், கடவாள், கடவும், கடவோம், கடவீர்கள், கடவார்கள், கடவும். But they also use the verbal, கடவது, to express desire, and it corresponds to the Latin word *utinam!* O that! as we shall explain in the following chapter, when we treat of the mode of supplying the optative Hence some, improperly, reckon among the modes of commanding, these phrases: செய்யக் கடவாய், போகக்கடவீர்கள், &c.: for they are not expressed commands, but signify, *thou oughtest to do, you ought to go,* & c. And certainly I may properly say, செய்யக்கடவேன், in the first person, which in all languages the Imperative Mood wants.

86. 8. தக்க: this word, by the same person as above' is called a Noun Adjective, when in truth it is the Participle Praeterite from the defective verb தகுகிறது: which, as we have said at number 60, has in the praeterite, தக்கேன், and therefore has as the participle of the praeterite, தக்க, which in the ordinary way, (which we shall describe in the next chapter,) becomes a noun substantive, by adding for the masculine அவன், for the feminine அவள், for the neuter அது, by always striking out one *a,* and it becomes, தக்கவன், தக்கவள், தக்கது. But the verb தகுகிறது signifies *to be meet to become.* It has besides the said words, all the words of

the future, தருவான் தருவாய், தருவான், &c. of which the third person neuter is தரும்; which word serves also, by the general rule, number 72, as well for the participle future, as the participle present: thus பொறுக்கத்தகும் பாவம், *a sin, which it is meet to pardon, a remissible sin.* It has the Infinitive., தக; the gerund தக்கு, which is not used in the vulgar dialect, in which nevertheless they use, as we have said, the participle, தக்க. It has the negative word, தகேன், தகாய், &c., of which the third person neuter is தகா, or தகாது, *it does not become.* It has the negative gerund தகாது, or தகாமல், and participle, தகாத; whence பொறுக்கத்தகாத பாவம், is, *a sin irremissible, which it is not becoming to pardon.* From this verb comes also the word தகுதி, propriety. Just as from மிகுகிறது, *to increase,* மிகுதி, *increase:* from தொகுகிறது, *to be united,* neuter, comes தொகுதி, *a congregation;* from பகுகிறது, *to be devided into parts,* neuter, comes பகுதி, *a portion:* hence since the *tribute,* which is given to a king, may be the *portion* which is meet for each person (to pay) according to distributive justice, it is called, பகுதி, &c. Finally, from what has been said here, it is evident from what root comes that phrase, *e g.* சொல்லத்தக்கதாக; there are three words சொல்ல, தக்கது, ஆக, and it is explained by this one word, *ad dicendum, to say,* which in Tamul also, you might more elegantly have expressed by this one word, சொல்ல. But it cannot be excused from error, what a certain person has written, that in place of saying, சொல்லத்தக்கதாக வந்தேன், it may be said, சொல்லத்தக்க வந்தேன்; for since

தக்க is made the word of the participle, which in this language can never be separated from a substantive, and no substantive here follows it, that phrase can by no means be used; even as we cannot say, சொன்ன வந்தேன்; and yet the construction in either case is the same. But you may very well say, சொல்லத்தக்க செய்தி. In order that these things may be yet more clearly evident, you should know that there is another verb, தக்குகிறது, which we use in order to say, *that the possession of anything remains to any one*. Thus when I give anything to another person, if he wishes to say, *this is above my condition, it does dot suit me*; he might say, இதெனக்குத் தகாது, from the verb தகுகிறது. But if he wishes to say, *this will not remain in my* power, another will take it away by force: then he might say, இதெனக்குத் தக்காது, from the verb தக்குகிறது. This last verb has for the Infinitive தக்க; whance this same word is the word of the participle praeterite from the verb தகுகிறது, and the word of the Infinitive from the verb தக்குகிறது; and therefore the same word signifies, *convenient, becoming* and *to remain*, or, *that it may remain*. Hence this phrase, செய்யத் தக்க பிற காரமாகச் செய்துனக்கிது தக்கப்பண்ணுவேன், *in a way suitable for doing so, I will cause that this may remain to you*; where in the first place, since the தக்க is the participle from தகுகிறது, it does not double the following ப; but in the second place, since the தக்க is the Infinitive from தக்குகிறது, it does double the following ப; all according the rules given in the First Chapter on the increase of letters.

87. 9. கூடும் from the verb கூடுகிறது; this signifies *to be joined together*, in the neuter sense *to coalesce, to come together*. Thus, if I wish to say, *he came together with me*, either in a journey or in opinion, or for any work: I might say, என்னோடவன் கூடினான். So, in order to say, *those boards unite with each other very well*, I might say, இந்தப் பலகைகள் நன்றாய்க் கூடினது, &c And in this sense this verb is not defective in any word at all, and is conjugated according to the general rules without any exception, and is daily employed, as to all the words, in everybody's mouth. But sometimes it means also that *something mah be done*, by occurring in the nominative, not as the casual power, but as the possibility of effect; and according to the first signification it is the same as if I should say, *this effect agrees with that cause*. In this sense all the persons do not occur, but only the third of the neuter; for the present and future, கூடும்; for the praeterite, கூடினது; for the infinitive, கூட; for the gerund, கூடி; for the participles, கூடுகிற, கூடின, கூடும்; for the negative கூடாது, கூடாமல்; கூடாத, &c. But in this sense, and in similar words, we use the verb. ஆகிறது; thus, இது செய்யக் கூடும், or செய்யலாகும், *this can be done*; so, இது செய்யக் கூடாது, or செய்யலாகாது, *this cannot be done;* so, செய்யக் கூடின வேலை, or செய்யலான வேலை, *the work which can be done*, &c.

88. 10. Finally, amongst the defective verbs, even although this undeservedly, I will add, போல I have said undeservedly, for a smuch as this word is from the verb,

போலுகிறது, which signifies *to resemble*, neuter; and requires an accusative: which verb is neither defective, nor irregular in the more elegant dialect, in which it has, for its present, போலுகிறேன்; for the praeterite, போன்றேன்; for the future, போலுவேன், & c. Still since they are never used in the vulgar dialect, except these four words, போல, போலும், போல், போலே, conceding to the custom, I reckon it among the defectives Of these போல, *pōla*, is the word of the Infinitive, and according to the force of the same infinitive, it signifies, *that I may resemble, thou mayest resemble*, and so on, for every person. Thus, இவனைப்போலச் செய், *do, as he does*, that is *do so, that you may resemble him*, &c. போலும், is the third person neuter of the future, and as usual is used also for the present; thus, இந்தப் பூனை புலியை போலுமே, *certainly that cat resembles a tiger*, & c. This same word is also the participle future, and is substituted also for the present; and then it ought always to precede, and immediately be joined to another noun, and is equivalent to the adjective, *like*; thus, புலிகளைப் போலுஞ் சேவகரைக் கண்டேன், *I have seen soldiers like tigers*, & c. போல், *pōl*, and, *e* being added, போலே, according to the rules of more elegant dialect is a contraction from *pólum*, the participle, and signifies the same thing; and is always well explained by, *as, just as*. And they all, as I have said, always require an accusative.

CHAPTER–IV

OF SYNTAX

SECTION–I

Of the Construction of a Sentence

89. Just as a work is more adorned by art, than by matter so every idiom acquires value, not so much from the selection of the words, as from the propriety of their construction. We often utter Latin words, not as the Latines would have uttered them; and still oftener do we speak an European language in Tamul words. A man had drawn out his discourse in this way for a long time, when a certain old woman innocently requested; Tell us, I pray you, in our language, what you have so eloquently descanted on in your own; he was, covered with confusion, for he fancied that he had been speaking as the Tamulians do. But that I may by way of caution give an example to the candidates of this language. Where Christ said, *who will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican;* they have translated the, *let him be to thee,* உனக்கிருக்கட்டு, which is, *retain to thee*; which certainly is not equivalent to Christ's Idea, where the *let him be to thee,* signifies, *let him be accounted by thee,* and in Tamul should be expressed, உனக்கவ னாகக்கடவான். Wherefore I think it worth while to add a few observations on Tamul Syntax: few indeed, the vastness of the idiom considered; yet to beginners they will seem to be more than enough.

90. But to begin from the construction of a sentence: of this I may venture to say, that it will be more elegant, in proportion as it more nearly approaches the more elegant style of the Latin Language; although it may have phrases sometimes differing from it, as I shall show hereafter Besides this language is specially fond of Laconism; and in proportion as you express your meaning in fewer words, so much the more elegantly always will you speak. Hence in those writings which the Tamulians have left for posterity you will not once perhaps read *e g.* போகத்தக்கதாக, for போக; nor ராயனென்கிற நாமத்தைக்கொண்டிருக்கிறவன், for ராயனென்பவன்; nor என்று சொல்லுகிறது அனுசரிக்கத்தகுங் குன்றாத சத்தியமாகுமென்கிறத்துக்குச் சந்தேகமில்லை, which can be well explained by these two words, என்பது நிச்சயந் தானே, &c. Wherefore to use everywhere these and similar phrases in those works especially which are written for posterity, cannot be consonant with the style of this language Hence since the verb இருக்கிறது, may mean, *I am, thou art* &c. in every phrase where *to be* is construed with a double nominative, as *God is good,* the Tamulians do not generally add இருக்கிறது, but complete the sentence laconically without any verb. Thus அவனார், *who is he?* இது நல்லதோ, *is this good?* and அவனாரிருக்கிறான், &c. would be barbarous. So you will more elegantly say: வந்தவனெங்கே, *where is he who has come?* இது பாவம், அது புண்ணியம், *this is sin, that virtue;* ஆண்டவர் சித்தமானார், *The Lord hath determined,* &c. And although it is possible to say,

வந்தவனெங்கேயிருக்கிறான்; இது பாவமாயிருக்கும்; அது புண்ணியமாயிருக்கும்; ஆண்டவர் சித்தமாயிருந்தார், &c. yet those are expressed more elegantly, because more briefly. But that I may give, in order, some rules for the construction of a sentence, let the

91. Rule I be. The Tamulians use the Nominative as the Latins do. Sometimes they use it in place of the accusative: பணந் தந்தேன், instead of saying, பணத்தைத் தந்தேன், *I have given money, &c.*, which I do not however approve if done often. They seen also often to use the nominative instead of the genitive; thus மரக்கொம்பு, for மரத்தின் கொம்பு, *the bough of a tree:* So மலையுச்சி, for மலையினுச்சி, *the peack of a mountain, &c.* But in reality they do not use the nominative instead of the genitive, but they use a noun substantive in the manner of an adjective, according to the rules which I have given at number 43. Hence they will never say, மரங்கொம்பு, ஆடு குட்டி, ஆறு மணல், *&c.*, which if they did say, they would in truth use the nominative மரம் ஆடு, ஆறு, *&c.* for the oblique; but according to the rules for adjectives they say, மரக்கொம்பு, ஆட்டுக்குட்டி, ஆற்று மணல், *&c.* Wherefore also, when according to the rules there given they put some nouns joined together without any change from the nominative, as மலை மனுஷன், குளிர்காற்று, *&c* they must then also not be said to use the nominative for the genitive, but to use a substantive in the manner of an adjective. Wherefore although மலை means *mountain,* and குளிர் *cold;* still மலை மனுஷன், does not mean, *a man of the mountain,*

but a *mountaineer;* and குளிர் காற்று, is not, *a wind of cold;* but *a cold wind:* and so of all others.

92. Rule 2. The use of the Genitive differs from the Latin Syntax in this; that they never use the Genitive unless it is joined to another noun, which it immediately precedes, and on which it depends, as an effect on a cause, a part on the whole, a subject on his lord, &c. Or also they add it to some nouns, which are taken as I shall describe below, as a kind of particles or propositions.

93. Rule 3. The Tamulians are accustomed to use the Dative, generally as the Latins do. Thus (I) Since in Latin I might more elegantly say, *quod tibi nomen, what name is to thee?* than, *quod est nomen tuum, what is thy name?* So in Tamul it will be better for me to say, உனக்குப் பேரென்ன, than உன் பேரென்ன. So *e.g.* it were better for me to say in Latin, *malis omnibus universalis medicina est patientia, for all evils the universal medicine is patience,* than *malorum omnium medicina, &c. of all evils the medicine,* &c. Just so in Tamul, the dative is here more elegant than the genitive: எல்லா நோய்க்குப் பொது மருந்தாகும் பொறுமை. Thus in either idiom it is more elegant to use the dative in these phrases: பெண்ணுக்கழகு நாணம் *the beauty to a woman, is modesty;* யானைக்குத் தொங்கும் காது, *the ears to an elephant hang down:* பாவமே மனுஷருக்குப் பகை, *an enemy to the human race is sin;* and this like. So to express *advantage, disadvantage,* and generally in all cases where the Latins elegantly use the dative, the Tamulians properly use it also.

2) Contrary to the custom of the Latins they use the dative in comparatives: thus அதுக்கிது பெரிது, *this is greater to that*; so, எனக்கு நீய் சாஸ்திரியோ, *in what art thou more learned to me*? &c. And this mode is very elegant.

3) When they express *distance*, either one or both ends of the *distance* come in the dative; thus, to say, *the city called Tanjore is distant from this ten miles*; they say, இதுக்குந் தஞ்சாவூருக்கும் பத்து நாழிகை வழியுண்டு; and both termini come in the dative. Or they say, இதுக்குத் தஞ்சாவூர் பத்து நாழிகை வழித்தூரம்; and then one terminus only comes in the dative, but the other in the nominative. Hence by this Rule, when அப்புறம், அப்பால், *beyond*; இப்புறம், இப்பால், *on this side*, import distance, they require a dative; thus ஆற்றுக்சப்புறம் or அப்பால், *beyond the river*; ஆற்றுக்கிப்புறம் or இப்பால், *on this side of the river*; So மேல் *above*, கீழ் *beneath*, முன் *before*, பின் *after*, since they are words of distance, are generally annexed to the dative, and not to the accusative as with the Latins. Thus இதுக்கு மேல், அதுக்குக் கீழ், இதுக்குமுன், அதுக்குப் பின், &c. Hence also *motion to a place* requires the dative; thus ஊருக்குப் போனான், *he went to the town*; வீட்டுக்கு வந்தான், *he came home*, &c.

4) *Time* also generally comes in the dative; இன்றைக்கு வா, *I came to day*; நாளைக்குச் சொல்வேன், *I will tell tomorrow*; இரண்டு வருஷத்துக்கு நீய் வராமலேன், *wherefore hast thou not come for two years*, &c. I have said *generally*, for they do also use the Ablative இல், as in its place we shall describe.

5) The *end*, which is aimed at, is expressed by the Dative; என்னத்துக்கு வந்தாய், *for what hast thou come?* & c. Hence as often as the Latins express the end, which they intend, by the accusative with the preposition *in towards;* or *ad, to;* or *propter, because of;* or even by the particle *ut that;* or *ne, lest*, with the subjective; in all these cases, we may, in Tamul, properly use the dative; thus, *I have written these things, laudem,* or *ad laudem,* or *propter laudem divinam, to the divine praise;* is well rendered in Tamul தேவஸ்தோத்திரத்துக்கிதை யெழுதினேன். So, *ut bene loquaris,* &c., *that yo may speak well, you need practice,* நீ நன்றாய்ப் பேசும்படிக்குப் பழக்கம் வேணும். So, *ne ego morerer,* &c., *lest I should die,* or *that I might not die, he hath died,* நான் சாகாதபடிக்குத் தானே செற்றான், &c. which would be well expressed by the word of the Infinitive, as in its place I will explain; ஸோதாத்திரமாக, பேச, சாகாதிருக்க, &c.

6) Degrees of consanguinity, affinity, dependance, and others which imply degrees, are expressed by the Dative. Thus to one asking me, உனக்கிவ னென்னாக வேணும், (for as much as என் is the same as என்ன,) *who,* or *what is this man to thee?* the answer will be, இவனெனக் குத் தகப்பன்; or எனக்கு மகன்; or எனக்கு மச்சினன்; or எனக்கடிமை; or எனக்கு ஸேநகிதன், &c. *that man is, father to me;* or *son;* or *relation;* or *captice;* or *friend,* &c.

94. Rule 4. The use of the accusative is this; as often as the verb expresses any action, whether of efficiency or respect, or possession, or hatered, or love, & c., the

noun, which is directly affected by the verb, is always used in the Accusative: thus, சோற்றையாக்கினான், வீட்டைக்கட்டினான், பாஷையைப் படித்தான், பலனை யடைந்தான், இவனைக் கண்டான், இதைக் குறித்தான், ஆஸ்தியை யுடையான், மலையை யேறினான், நம்மைப் பகைத்தான், என்னை ஸேநகித்தான், அவனைத் துடர்ந்தான், வீட்டை நீக்கினான், பகையைக் கொண்டான், சீலையைக் கொண்டான், பாவத்தை விட்டான், &c. And so constantly do they use this rule, that if the verb directly affects two nouns both will be used in the accusative. Thus when, *e.g.* the verb படிப்பிக்கிறது, *to teach*, directly affects both that which we teach, and him whom we teach; after the manner of the Latins this verb requires two accusatives. Thus என்னைச் சாஸ்திரங்களைப் படிப்பித்தான், *he has taught me the sciences*: and although some may use the dative of the person who is taught and say *e.g.* எனக்கு. &c., still this, if it be excused from solecism, is to be condemned for barbarism. Thus, though the verb சொல்லுகிறது *to say, e g.* requires, that what is said should come in the accusative; to whom it is said, in the dative, as with the Latins: nevertheless when to any one, the praises or vituperations of himself are uttered; then, because the verb expresses a kind of action directly upon him also, they more elegantly use two accusatives; thus, அவனை ஸ்தோத்திரங்களைச் சொன்னேன். இவனைத் தூஷணங்களைச் சொன்னேன். But if I wish to express, that, *e.g.* one has related to me the praises or abuse, which he had uttered against another, then, since those praises and

vituperations in no way directly affect me to whom they are related; I must say in Tamul, not *me*, accusative; but *to me*, dative; thus, அவனைச் சொன்ன தூஷணங்களை யெனக்குச் சொன்னான், *he related to me the vituperations which he had uttered against him*, &c.

95. Rule 5. The use of the Vocative does not differ from the Latin Syntax: for as much as they use the Vocative, not merely, when they call any one, as மகனே வா, *come, O son!* but also when they invoke the Deity; thus, யேசுவே யென்னை யிரட்சியும், *O Jesu, save me!* Moreover they use the Vocative in praising any body: thus பரிசுத்த மாதாவே, *O most pure mother!* Finally they use it to express grief: thus, a mother, *e g.* who mourns for a dead son, will often repeat, என் மகனே, என் மகனே, &c.. *myson, my son!*

96. Rule 6. Of the Ablatives, the First, which ends in இல், and properly corresponds with our ablative *in*, serves

(1) To express the place of existence: thus, மலை யிலிருக்கும் புலிகள், *tigers are in the mountains.*

(2) By this ablative is expressed *motion from a place*: thus மலையில் விழுமாறு, *a river which falls from a mountain*; மரத்தில் விழுந்த பழம், *fruit which fell from the tree*, &c. In this sense they add to this ablative the gerund இருந்து, or நின்று, and then the phrase is more clear; thus தன் வீட்டி லிருந்து வந்தான், *he came from his own house*; so, மேகத்தில் நின்று மழை பெய்தது, *rain fell from the clouds*; &c.

(3.) This Ablative is used in comparison, when we call one better than another; for then, that which is the worse, comes in the ablative இல்; thus, அதிலே யிது நல்லது, *this is better than that.* And still more elegantly, to this ablative in this sense, they add உம்: thus, அதிலேயும் யிது நல்லது.

(4.) But if, in the same way, a noun implying universality occurs in the ablative இல், the same phrase serves for superlative, which the Tamulians are without. Thus அதிலிது நல்லது, is the comparitive, *this is better than that*; but எல்லாத்திலு மிது நல்லது, is the superlative, *this is best of all*; and so of the rest. Moreover of the Superlative they use also another and more elegant mode: for instance, if, the same noun being repeated, one of these comes in the ablative plural இல், it expresses excellence, and has the force of the superlative degree, செல்வங்களிற் செல்வம், *felicity the most perfect of all*: so அபத்தங்களிலபத்தம், *an error the worst of all*: so நன்மைகளில் நன்மை, *a good the greatest of all*, &c. This mode agrees with the Hebrew language, which, in like manner, since it wants the superlative, supplies the defect of it by doubled nouns, using one of them in the genitive plural, as we see very often in the Holy Scriptures: thus, *God of Gods*, means, *the most great God*; so, *the song of songs*, means the most excellent song: so, *vanity of vanities*, means *the most vain thing*: so *holy of holies*, means, *the most holy thing*, &c.

(5.) It serves for the ablative of Time: முற்காலத்திலே, *in time past;* வருங்காலத்திலே, *in time to come;* இத்தறுவாயிலே, *on this occasion,* &c.

(6.) This ablative ends also in the word இடத்தில், which word in the ablative இல், from the noun இடம், *a place:* and then it is used in the first and second application; and also elegantly in place of the preposition *amongst, with;* thus, *all, these are not with me,* இதெல்லா மென்னிடத்திலில்லை. So for the ablative of the place: கடலிடத்தில் முத்து, *pearls are in the sea;* நீரிடத்தி லன்னம், *the swan inhabits, where there are waters,* &c. Also, and more elegantly, to express an effect from its cause: thus, பூவிடத்தில் வாசனை, *an odor emanates from a flower;* சூரியனிடத்திலொளி, *light from the sun;* புண்ணியத்திடத்தி லின்பம், *delight from virtue,* &c.

97. Rule 7. The second Ablative, in ஆல், is properly our ablative with the preposition *a* or *ab, by* or *from:* whence it is properly used to express the cause, whether efficient, or material, or instrumental, or even the condition sine non quânon. Thus, பனியாலெ குளிர், *cold from dew;* தீயினாலெ புகை, *from fire smoke;* இவனாற் கெட்டேன், *by him, or because of him I perish, &c ;* and these of the effective cause. So மரத்தாற் செய்த சிலை, *a statue made from wood* & c. the material cause. So ஆணியா லறைந்தான், *he affixed it with a nail;* அதைக் கண்ணாலே கண்டேன், *I saw that with my eyes,* &c. the instrumental cause. So செய்த வேலையினாற் கூலி வரும், *from work finished pay will come,* i.e. if you have done your work, you will receive pay, &c., the

condition sine quânon. Hence, as with the Latins, with verbs passive, the agent is put in the ablative *by* or *from;* so with the Tamulians it is put in the ablative ஆல்: thus அவனாற் சொல்லப்பட்டதிது, *this was said by him,* & c.

98. Rule 8. The third Ablative, ஒடு, is properly equivalent to our Ablative of Society: அவனோடு வந்தேன், *I came with him,* & c. By this ablative they express also the cause, and use it almost indifferently with the ablative in ஆல் just described. Thus, புண்ணியத்தால் or புண்ணியத்தோடு நன்மையெல்லாம் வரும், *all good things will come with virtue,* or *from virtue*: so ஆணியால் or ஆணியோடறைந்தான்; so கண்ணால் or கண்ணோடே கண்டேன், & c. Besides by this ablative they express possession: ஆஸ்தியோடிருந்தான், *he was with riches, he was rich;* ஆரோக்கியத்தோடே போனான், *he departed with health, well:* பாவத்தோடிருக்கிறான், *he is in sin,* & c.

99. *Appendix:* When a verb expressing action affects direct by a noun which is the name of a part of anything; then the name of the part comes in the accusative, but the principal noun in the genitive: thus பூனையின் வாலை யறுத்தேன், *I cut off the tail of the cat*. Secondly, the principal noun may more elegantly come in the dative: thus பூனைக்கு வாலை யறுத்தேன், *I cut off the tail to the cat*. Or even, thirdly, the principal noun may come in the accusative, add the noun of the part in the ablative இல்: thus பூனையை வாலிலே யறுத்தேன், *I cut off the cat in the tail.* So, என் கன்னத்தை யடித்தான், or எனக்கு கன்னத்தை யடித்தான்,

or என்னைக் கன்னத்தி லடித்தான், *he struck my face,* or *the face to me,* or *me in the face*

The Tamulians in their own Grammar say, that in such a case, both nouns, the principal and of the part, may also be used in the accusative; and that it may be said பூனையை வாலை யறுத்தேன், என்னைக் கன்னத்தையடித்தான், &c. which however is not said in Latin, and does not sound well and does not sound well in Tamul.

SECTION II.

Of the Noun.

100. Purposing to give some rules for the parts of a sentence, I will begin with the Noun. And

1. It is of the highest importance to the elegance of composition, to use every noun in its own sense and with propriety; for as much as, expressions which else where are very elegant, the sense being altered. sound barbarously. And although it belongs to the Laxicon to show every peculiar sense of all nouns and verbs: Still I consider it worth while, to give here shortly, a few nouns, which are more necessary and variable, that they may be more easily noted by beginners. Wherefore

1. The Tamul Language possesses many nouns. by which it expresses the infancy as well of men and animals, as of trees, which it is not allowable to use indifferently. Of these, குழந்தை and பிள்ளை, they use speaking of men; and பிள்ளை, they use besides speaking of palm trees when they are small: தென்னம்பிள்ளை, குஞ்சு, they use speaking of birds, of mice, of fishes, of insects: thus, புறாக்குஞ்சு, *the chick of a dove;* கோழிக் குஞ்சு, *the chick of a hen;* எலிக்குஞ்சு, மீன்குஞ்சு, &c. The young off-spring of four-footed animals they call by the common term குட்டி: thus சிங்கக் குட்டி, குதிரைக் குட்டி, நாய்க் குட்டி, &c. This is also spoken of serpants; பாம்புக் குட்டி. Of the larger fishes some say, குட்டி; thus சுறாக் குட்டி. From this general rule except *mice,* as we have said, whose young they call, குஞ்சு.

Except also the calves of cows and buffaloes, (the Portuguese call them *bufaros*), which can by no means be called simply குட்டி; but they must be called கன்று, or கன்றுக் குட்டி: thus பசுவின் கன்று, or பசுவின் கன்றுக்குட்டி; எருமைக் கன்று or எருமைக் கன்றுக்குட்டி, But of horses and asses, besides குட்டி, we may also say, மறி: thus, குதிரை மறி or கழுதை மறி. So besides குட்டி, we may say, கன்று; of deer, மான் கன்று; of camels ஒட்டக் கன்று; and of elephants, யானைக் கன்று. Finally of all plants, which are young, except the palm, as I have said above, the name used is, கன்று: மாங்கன்று, வேப்பங்கன்று, புளியங்கன்று முருங்கைக் கன்று, &c.

101. 2. The Tamulians, in order to express male or female, use the common word, ஆண், பெண்; and this may be spoken of either, even of animals and birds: but still if it be spoken absolutely, it is used only for mankind; for which also they add the word பிள்ளை. Thus, ஆண்பிள்ளை, பெண்பிள்ளை; neither however does it signify *the son of a man*, or *of a woman*, but is absolutely, *a man* or *a woman* and when it thus has பிள்ளை added, it can by no means be spoken of other animals. Of these however they call the male of birds சாவல், the female பெட்டை with the first short, and they place these before or after the proper name of each bird: thus சாவற் கோழி, or கோழிச் சாவல், *a cock;* பெட்டைக்கோழி, or கோழிப்பேட்டை, *a hen;* சாவற் புறா, *a cock pigeon;* பெட்டைப்புறா, *a hen pigeon,* &c. But about quadrupeds they vary; for instance as regards oxen, if it be *a bull calf,* they say காளைக் கன்று;

if *a cow calf*, கிடாரிக் கன்று if they are larger than small calves, they are called simply, the male காளை, the female கிடாரி. But if they are fit for labor, the *ox* is called எருது, the *cow* பசு. But the *bull* they call பொலிவெருது. Of buffaloes, which I have said the Portuguese call *bufaros*., they call the male of whatever age கிடா, to which, if it be little, they add கன்று, கிடாக்கன்று: the female they always call எருமை, and, if little, எருமைக் கன்று, Of horses and asses the male is called. குண்டு; thus குண்டுக் குதிரை, குண்டுக் கழுதை: but the female கோளிகை; thus கோளிகைக் குதிரை, கோளிகைக் கழுதை. Of other quadrupeds, they call the female, by the common word பெட்டை; thus பெட்டையாடு, பெட்டை மான், பெட்டைப் பூனை, பெட்டை நாய், &c. But as regards the male they vary: for instance, the male of dogs, cats, wolves, monkeys and others of this sort, they call கடுவன்: of deer கலை; of sheeps and goats கிடாய். All which doubtless are not to be despised: for I have seen them laugh heartily at one who called *a male lamb*, சாவல்; and who amongst ourselves also, would be able to restrain his laughter if he should hear a male lamb called, *a cock*.

102. 3. That I may say something of trees. The Latins say, *folium, a leaf*, indiscriminately, of herbs, of trees, of all flowers, &c. The Tamulians however do indeed call by the common word இலை, the leaves of trees or of a flowering plant; nevertheless the greater number are excepted, which are noted by a special name; for instance, they call the leaves of every kind of palm, ஓலை, பனை

யோலை, கூந்தற்பனையோலை, தென்னோலை: these last they also call by the common word இலை, தென்னிலை. The leaves of the shrub called *Tālei,* they call ஓலை, தாழையோலை. Moreover they call the leaves on whicn they write ஏடு, with the first long; and the leaves of the tree called Camugu, கமுகேடு; and the leaves of flowers, (the petals), but not the leaves of their plants, பூவினோடு; and these last they call also இதழ், பூவிதழ். But the Fruits to trees, if they are very small, as when a blossom has scarcely fallen from them, they call, by the common word பிஞ்சு; but if they are large, but immature, they are called காய்: but if ripe பழம் or கனி But of every kind of pulse or beans, if the fruits be very tender, they are called, not பிஞ்சு, but புனல்; if larger but not ripe, காய்: but when they are ripe, they are called, not பழம் or கனி, but, because they grow dry to become ripe, நெத்து, with the first short. Moreover there are many trees which produce fruits in one cluster, so to say, at the same time; this cluster they call குலை or தாறு. We may use either name for the fruit of the tree called *Camugu*: கமுகங் குலை, கமுகந் தாறு. For that of Dates: பேரீச்சங் குலை, பேரிச்சந் தாறு. Of the Indian Fig: வாழைக்குலை, வாழைத் தாறு. But of Plams குலை only can be said, and not தாறு; thus, தென்னங் குலை, பனங்குலை. But of the Plam and the Camugu பாளை is also is said: thus தென்னம்பாளை, கமுகம் பாளை, The clusters, if I may so say, of these trees are thus called; just as also the sort of involucrum, or leafy envelope, from which those clusters proceed. But if I

wish to speak of a single fruit, they must be called either by the common name பிஞ்சு, or காய், or பழம்: thus the fruit of the Palm, தேங்காய்; the fruit of the Indian Fig வாழைக்காய், வாழைப்பழம், &c. But we shall carefully note as many others of this kind as possible in the Lexicon.

103. Moreover II. It appertains to Syntax, to know, that the Tamulians have as many appellative nouns as possible; and every one is at liberty, at pleasure to compound a new, not so many, but a great many more, which undoubtedly cannot be found in a Lexicon: for which (custom) these rules may be suggested.

1. They form appellative nouns of men, by adding to the noun substantive word காறன் for the masculine, and காறி for the feminine. Thus from சீட்டு, *an epistle, a letter*, comes சீட்டுக்காறன், *a letter-carrier*; from தோட்டம், *a garden*, comes தோட்டக்காறன், *a gardener*, &c. in which composition the rules of adjectives are to be observed. For the first noun is used in the manner of an adjective: hence those which end in ம், lose this, as may be seen in the example தோட்டக்காறன். So by the same rules, words which end in து, டு, று, double their own last consonant, and from எருது, comes எருதுக்காறன்; from ஆடு, comes ஆட்டுக்காறன்; from வயறு, comes வயற்றுக்காறன், &c. But besides that this method is not so elegant, we cannot at all times use it: for the word காறன் cannot be added to all nouns, but generally to those only which either express *duty* or *office*, as the examples given show;

or which imply *passion* of mind or body: thus கோபக்காறன், *a wrathful; man* வியாதிக்காறன், an *infirm* man, &c. If I wish to form an appellative noun, from a noun of *place* for example, as we from *Rome*, say *Roman*, the word காறன் can by no means be added. For if, for example, from மலை, *a mountain*, to make *mountaineer*, I shoud say மலைக்காறன், even the old woman would laugh at me. So it would be ridiculous to say இவனெந்த வூர்க்காறன், *of what place is that man?* அவன் தஞ்சாவூர்க்காறன், *he is an inhabitant of the city called Tanjore;* but it ought to be expressed, மலையான், எந்தவூரான், தஞ்சாவூரான், &c.

104. 2. Some adduce another way, by which nouns may become appellative; namely by adding, to the noun substantive, உள்ளவன், உள்ளவள்: thus, ஆங்காரமுள்ளவன், *a proud man;* மலையிலுள்ளவன், *a mountaineer*, &c. But these ought to be called, not appellative nouns, but phrases; for they consist of the pronoun அவன், அவள், with the participle உள்ள, and another noun substantive: whence altough we may properly render them in Latin by appellative nouns, as I have done; still literally they are rendered, *he who has pride, he who dwells in a mountain* Wherefore.

105. 3. The Tamulians are wont, at pleasure, to compound new appellative nouns, in another very elegant way; which way is common to every kind of nouns. Thus from ஆங்காரம் *pride*, comes ஆங்காரன் *a proud man*, ஆங்காரி *a proud woman*, and sometimes also *a proud man;* from உதாரம் *liberality*, comes உதாரன் *a liberal man*, உதாரி *a*

liberal woman, & c. But from பாவம், comes பாவி *a sinner, male or female*: from லோபம், comes லோபி *au avaricious man or woman*, & c. From முகம், comes முகத்தான், முகத்தாள்: from பட்டணம், comes பட்டணத்தான், பட்டணத்தாள், & c. From அழகு, comes அழகன், அழகி: from கழுத்து, கழுத்தன், கழுத்தி, & c. For which there are more rules, which I shall give in the grammar of the more elegant idiom: here I will add this only, that appellatives are formed from nouns, especially of places, if to the noun, taken as an adjective, there be added, for the masculine அன் or ஆன், and for the feminine ஆள். Thus from கற்பாளையம், the name of a certain town comes கற்பாளையத்தான், கற்பாளையத்தாள்: from மலை, மலையன் or மலையான் or மலையாள்: from ஊர், ஊரான், ஊராள்.

106. Moreover from every verb, appellative nouns are formed, in this way. To the Participles of the Present, the Praeterite and the word of the negative, they add the pronoun அவன், அவள், by striking out always one *a*; thus, செய்கிறவன், செய்கிறவள், செய்தவன், செய்தவள், செய்யாதவன், செய்யாதவள், & c. For the Future, however, appellative nouns are formed, not from the participle, but from the word of the first person future, which if it ends ப்பேன் or பேன், ஏன் is taken away, and அவன், அவள் added. Thus from இருப்பேன், comes இருப்பவன், இருப்பவள்: from காண்பேன், காண்பவன், காண்பவள்: from என்பேன், என்பவன், என்பவள், &c. But if the future ends in வேன், வ being changed into ப, it is terminated in the same way. Thus from செய்வேன், செய்பவன், செய்

பவள்: from விடுவேன், comes விடுபவன், விடுபவள், & c. And this way is the more elegant, and it serves also for the present: *e. g.* ராயனென்பவன், *the man who is called Rayen,* that is *Peter,* & c. They also sometimes use, and still more elegantly, the very word itself of the third person either of the praeterite or future, in the manner of an appellative noun: செய்தான், செய்தாள், செய்வான், செய்வாள்; and for both Genders in the plural, செய்தார், செய்வார்: which words, both signify and are declined in the manner of nouns, Thus they say செய்தாரைப்போலே, *as those, who have made*: செய்வாரில்லை, *there is not who may make,* & c. So தின்மை செய்வார்க்கு நன்மை செய், *do good to those who do evil.* Hence the word பாடுவான், means *a singer,* & c.

107. From every verb are formed moreover many verbals, which are declined in the manner of nouns, and

1. From the participles of the present and praeterite come the verbals செய்கிறது, படிக்கிறது, and செய்தது, படித்தது, & c. Hence it appears, how improperly these words, *e. g.* செய்கிறது, சொல்லுகிறது, & c. are called words of the Infinitive: which certainly is not true, unless you may also say, that செய்கிறவன், செய்கிறவள், & c. are words of the Infinitive. But since they say, that these are, as they are, words of the participle present, with the addition of the pronoun அவன், அவள், from which are formed appellative nouns of men: so also, செய்கிறது is a word of the same participle, with the addition of the pronoun அது; from which comes the

noun verbal, which is declined throughout its cases, and does not correspond with the Latin Infinitive, except when this is taken as a noun, as in this proposition, *to study is good;* which I may translate, படிக்கிறது நல்லது. But in this sense other verbals also, of which hereafter, correspond with the Infinitive of the Latins; படித்தல், படிப்பு, & c., whence the proposition may be rendered. படித்தல் நல்லது, படிப்பு நல்லது, படிப்பது நல்லது, & c. But pray; are all these therefore to be called words of the Infinitive? For the future the verbal comes from the first word of the future, by changing ஏன் into அது: thus from செய்வேன், செய்வது; from படிப்பேன், படிப்பது; from என்பேன், என்பது, & c. This verbal is yet more elegant than the first, and is common to all verbs, and is used also for the present, and for the continuation of an action: *this which is, to do,* or *to be wont to do; this which is, to learn,* or *to be wont to learn,* & c. Hence we know the origin and force of that word, which in use is so common, ஆவது, For ior it is a verbal from the word ஆவேன், from the future of the verb ஆகிறது, which also signifies *to be;* whence the verbal ஆவது, signifies, *this which is, to be; essence:* so, அவன் சொன்ன செய்தியாவது, means, *the essence of the messenger; what he said.* Whence in truth, i scarcely adds anything in a sentence, since it would be enough to say, அவன் சொன்ன செய்தி, & c.

108. 2. Nouns verbal are formed by changing கிறது into கை: thus from செய்கிறது, செய்கை; from இருக்கிறது, இருக்கை; from ஆகிறது, ஆகை, & c. Which verbal we

use with elegance especially in the ablative இல் or ஆல்: thus இதிப்படியாகையில், *since this happens so;* இதிப்படியாகையால், *because this is so;* and ஆகையால் simply, at the beginning of a sentences, accords with *wherefore, on what account.*

109. The verbal ல் is formed by adding this consonant to the word of the Infinitive, of which I have spoken at Number 70. Thus from இருக்க, இருக்கல்; from செய்ய, செய்யல்; from வர, வரல், & c.; where, since after *a* short comes ல் final, the *a*, by the rule of which I have treated at Number 8, ought to be pronounced as if it were *e* soft, *iruquel, cheyyel, varel,* & c. This method is common certainly to all verbs; nevertheless we scarcely use it in the vulgar idiom except with the word ஆம் or ஆகாது, ஆன், or ஆகாத, from the verb ஆகிறது, when it implies *to be possible to be done,* or, *not to be possible to be done,* as is stated at Number 87. And thus we say நாமிங்கே யிருக்கலாம், *we can remain here!* நாளை நீவரலாம், *thou wilt be able to come to-morrow;* ஆண்டவரால் செய்யலாகாததுண்டோ, *is anything impossible with God?* & c. And, as may be seen in the examples adduced, we use the same word for every person, gender and number: and in truth the principal noun, which comes in the nominative, is in the said propositions the verbal itself, இருக்கல், வரல், செய்யல். There is another verbal like this, in common and vulgar use frequent in the high dialect; it is formed by changing க்கிறது into த்தல், and கிறது into தல். Thus from படிக்கிறது, comes படித்தல்; from ஆகிறது, ஆதல்;

from செய்கிறது, செய்தல், &c. Which verbal is declined through all the cases: *e g.* செய்தலின், செய்தலுக்கு, செய்தலில், செய்தலால், செய்தலோடு, &c. This method is very elegant, but yet not so common in the vulgar dialect.

110. Finally, a verbal is formed from verbs in க்கிறது, if, this being taken away, ப்பு be added: thus from இருக்கிறது, இருப்பு; from படிக்கிறது, படிப்பு; from கடுக்கிறது, கடுப்பு; from the defective verb ஒக்கிறது, ஒப்பு: &c. This verbal however scarcely retains the force of the verb: thus இருப்பு, does not signify this, which is *to be* any where, but properly *existence* in such and such a place: so படிப்பு, not this, which is *to study*, but *study*; so ஒப்பு, not this, which is *to be assimilated*, but it means *similitude*, &c.; and it is construed in the manner of nouns.

111. All nouns, which we have declined to be derived from verbs, whether appellatives, or verbals are in truth all declined as nouns, but are construed as verbs, if you except those which we have just stated to end in ப்பு. But all others require the case, which the verb requires from which they are derived: which does not happen with the Latins, where *amans*, *loving e.g.* (although it is from the verb *amo*, which requires an accusative,) when it is used not as a participle, but as an appellative noun, is construed like a noun, and requires a genitive of dependence, whence the expression, *virtutis amens*, *a lover of virtue*. But it is otherwise with the Tamulians where, *e.g.* from the verb படைக்கிறது, *to create*, is formed the appellative படைத்தோன் or படைத்தவன், *creator*: still this does not admit of a genitive

of dependence, but the thing created ought to be put in the accusative, which case is required by the verb படைக்கிறது. Thus it is said மனுஷரைப் படைத்தோன், whence literally, it ought to be rendered, not *Creator*, but *who has created men* But those which end in ப்பு like appellatives in Latin, are construed as nouns substantive: whence although படிக்கிறது, *to study, to learn*, requires an accusative; படிப்பு, admits not accusative, but a genitive of dependence; and the expression is, *e.g.* இந்தப் பாஷையின் படிப்புக் கடினம், *the study of this language is difficult*. But if I use another verbal, *e g.* படிக்கிறது or படிப்பது, then it by no means requires a genitive of dependence, but an accusative. Thus I may say, இந்தப் பாஷையைப் படிப்பது or படிக்கிறது கடினம்; and the reason is, because, as I have said above படிப்பு is properly, *study*; and படிக்கிறது or படிப்பது is properly, *this which is to study* whence that is construed in the manner of a noun, this in this manner of a verb. In this way verbals in கை sometimes signify, not as verbals, but as absolute nouns. Thus *e g.* செய்கை signifies indeed, *this which is to do,* but at the same time means *action,* &c. Wherefore in the first sense, these verbals are construed as verbs and are declined as nouns. Thus, இதை நீச் செய்கையில், *since thou doest that* &c. But in the second sense, they are both declined and construed in the manner of nouns, as if they were absolute nouns, and it is said, என் செய்கை, *my action*: நல்ல செய்கை, *a good action,* &c. And this may suffice for the Syntax of nouns.

SECTION III.

Of Verbs.

AND 1.

Of the method of supplying those which the language has not.

112 In a former chapter where I treated of the verbs, I only gave of Indicative mood, the present, the praeterite and the future tenses: for the Tamulians have neither the word of the imperfect nor of the pluperfect: they express however the ideas of them with sufficient plainness by means of phrases which ought to be given here, where I treat of the Syntax.

The Imperfect.

Wherefore 1. To express the Imperfect Tense, speaking of a thing past, I may use the word of the future. Thus praising a man who is now dead, if I wish to say, *That man worshipped the true God, he gave alms, he practised all virtues.* &c., I may say, அவனே மெய்யான சுவாமியை வணங்குவான், பிச்சையைக் கொடுப்பான், சகல புண்ணியங்களைச் செய்வான், &c. Whence often as we see the future used of a thing past, that is to be attributed to the Imperfect.

2. If to the gerund of any verb I add the word of the praeterite from the verb இருக்கிறது, *e. g.* சொல்லி யிருந்தேன், செய்திருந்தேன், &c. this phrase, if, from the context, it appears to agree in time with that which precedes or follows it in the sentence, then this phrase

supplies the place of the imperfect. Thus, நீய் வரும் போது நானிதைச் செய்திருந்தேன், may well be rendered, *at the time when thou didst come I was doing this.* For since my action which is expressed by that phrase, appears to agree in time with the coming of the other, it is well rendered by the Imperfect. Observe that that word வரும் போது also, since it is the word of the future, spoken of a thing past according to the rule stated, is equivalent to the Imperfect, *at the time when thou didst come.*

The Pluperfect.

113. But if that same phrase appears from the context not to correspond in time, but to have preceded: then it is substituted for the Pluperfect. Thus I may render, நீய் வருமுன்னே நானிதைச் செய்திருந்தேன், *before thou didst come I had done that:* to which is equivalent this also. நானிதைச், செய்திருந்து பிறகு நீய் வந்தாய், *thou camest after I had done that*: for it appears from the particles முன்னே, *before that,* or பிறகு, *after that,* that my action preceded in time his coming. Besides even without these or similar particles, if it appears from the context that the action expressed by the gerund with the praeterite இருந்தேன், preceded in time another action which is contained in the sentence, that phrase is always to be rendered by the pluperfect. Thus I should say, அனேகத் திரவியங்களை யடைந்திருந்தானாகிலுந் தரித்திரனாய்ச் செற்றான்; since I say, that he died poor, it sufficiently appears from the context, that when he died, he had not the riches which he had before acquired, whence the action of acquiring them, appears

from the context, to have preceded, in time, his death: hence I may very well render that proposition in this way, *he had indeed acquired many riches, but he died poor, & c.*

A certain Author gives for the Imperfect these two phrases: நீய் விசுவாசிக்கிறாயே யப்போதவன் விசுவாசித்தான், or, which he says is the more elegant, நீய் விசுவாசிக்கிறாயே யப்போ நான் விசுவாசிப்பேன். But for the Pluperfect he assigns this: நீய் விசுவாசிக்கிறாயே அதுக்கு முன்னே நான் விசுவாசிப்பேன். But I have never either read, or heard these phrases amongst the natives; yea, and what is more, I have not yet found one who could say that they were Tamul phrases, or could understand them.

The Optative.

114. This language wants the Optative Mood, which it supplies by other phrases. They use either the Infinitive ஆக, from the verb ஆகிறது; or the defective கடவது; or ஆகக்கடவது, or கடவதாக. But they distinguish the Tenses of the Optative in this way.

1) They either add those particles to the word of the Future, செய்வேனாக, செய்வாயாக, & c. Or செய்வேனாகக்கடவது, & c. Or they even add them to the verbal from the future, of which see Number 107, *e.g.* செய்வது, படிப்பது: thus செய்வதாக, or செய்யதாகக்கடவது, & c., or they even use the Infinitive with கடவது, e.g. செய்யக்கடவது, or செய்யக்கடவதாக, & c. All these phrases serve for the present, the imperfect and the future Optative: *O that I may do, I might do, I shall do!*. And except the first

mode, which is conjugated through the persons, all the others, without alteration, serve for any person and number, according to the noun which goes before it.

2. They use the gerund of any verb, with the infinitive இருக்க, to which they add named words, செய்திருக்கக்கடவது, or கடவதாக Or they use the verbal from the praeterite, *e. g.* செய்தது, to which they add ஆகக்கடவது: thus செய்ததாகக்கடவது. And these phrases serve for every person and number of the praeterite optative: thus, அங்கே பெய்திருக்கக்கடவது or பெய்ததாகக்கடவது, *O that now it may have rained there! &c.*

3. They use the gerund of any verb with the verbal of the praeterite from the verb இருக்கிறது, *e. g.* செய் திருந்தது, கேட்டிருந்தது, & c. to which they add those particles; thus நீயதைக் கேட்கும்போது நானுங்கூடக் கேட்டிருந்ததாகக்கடவது: this phrase serves for every person and number of the pluperfect optative; whence the said proposition is rendered, *whilst thou was hearing that, O that I also had heard at the same time!*

The Subjunctive If.

115. The Tamulians equally want the Subjunctive: but they supply in this way. From the word of the praeterite, changing the என் into ஆல், they form the word for the subjunctive, *if*: *e.g.* from வந்தேன், is formed வந்தால்; from இருந்தேன், இருந்தால்; from ஆனேன், ஆனால்; from படித்தேன், படித்தால், & c. They form the word for the same Subjunctive in another way also: from verbs which

end in க்கிறது, taking away றது, they add ல் it becomes க்கில்: thus from இருக்கிறது, இருக்கில்; from பார்க்கிறது, பார்க்கில், & c. But from verbs which end in கிறது, this is taken away, இல் is added and u, if it occur in it, is struck out: thus from சொல்லுகிறது, சொல்லில்; from காட்டு கிறது, காட்டில், & c. From these except, those which have in the praeterite இனேன், which rejecting னேன், add ல்: thus from வணங்கினேன், comes வணங்கில், & c which in reality is not an exception; forasmuch as, I have repeatedly said, it is not வணங்கிறது, except by syncope from வணங்குகிறது, & c. Whence வணங்கில் is formed according to the general rule: and so of other verbs of this kind. Except however those, which, before கிறது, have only one long syllable, as ஆகிறது, from which comes ஆகில்: from போறது, since in reality it is போகிறது, comes போகில்; from காண்கிறது, காண்கில், & c. Still this second mode is not indeed in daily and familiar use; it is nevertheless the more elegant. Moreover from the word of the negative verb the subjunctive is formed, from the gerund ādu, or by adding āl., Thus from செய்யாது, comes செய்யாதால், *unless he does it,* or, *has done it, & c,* or *if he does not do it, has not done it,* & c. which mode is elegant. Or it is formed by adding to the negative gerund, *e.g.* செய்யாது or செய்யாமல், the subjunctive இருந்தால், or போனால்: thus செய்யாதிருந்தால் or செய்யாமலிருந்தால்; so செய்யாதேபோனால், or செய்யாமற்போனால். Or finally it is formed, by taking away *du*, from the gerund ā*du* and adding the subjunctive விட்டால் from the verb விடுகிறது:

thus, செய்யாவிட்டால், சொல்லாவிட்டால். All which modes are compounded, and according to the composition they signify, *if he has been without doing or not doing, if he has gone without doing, if he has left without doing,* & c.

116. But these words having formed in ஆல் or இல், they use them for every person and number, and always add to them the word of the future, as I shall hereafter show by examples. But the use of these words is of this kind.

(1.) This word *e.g.* வந்தால், if it is preceded by a particle indicative of the time present, is substituted for the present of the subjunctive: thus இன்றைக்கு நான் வந்தாற் தருவாயோ, *if I come to day, will thou give it?*

(2.) But if from the context it appears, that I have said that, knowing that the condition cannot now be fulfilled, then the same phrase is substituted for the imperfect: *e g* I see a man going away another way, without saluting me, as I- expected, and I say, அவன் வந்தாற் பேசுவேனே: I may translate this, *if he came hither, I would speak to him.*

(3.) If however there preceds a particle indicating time future, the same phrase is substituted for the future subjunctive: thus நீய் நாளைக்கு வந்தா லிதைத் தருவேன், *if thou wilt come tomorrow, I will give you this.*

(4.) If I use the word of the subjunctive from the verb, இருக்கிறது, with the gerund of any verb, as செய்திருந்தால், வந்திருந்தால், & c; then if there precede a

particle of time present, it will be substituted for the praeterite subjunctive: thus இப்போதவர்கள் வந்திருந்தாலிதைத் தருவேன், *if they have now come I will give this.*

(5.) But if there precede a particle of time past, it is substituted for the pluperfect subjunctive: thus, நான் முன் வந்திருந்தா லிது வரப்போறதில்லை. *if I had come before, this would not have happened* &c.

ஆனால், ஆகில்.

117. Besides this method, they also often use another: for instance the word ஆனால் or ஆகில், from the verb ஆகிறது, if it be not joined to another verb, signifies, *if it be* &c. *e.g.* இதனால் நல்லதுதானே, *if this be, it is well indeed,* But if it is put after the word of another verb, it signifies simply, *if*, வாழுகிறாயாகில் நல்லது, *if thou art in good health, it is well.* But the Tamulians place this word after every person of the indicative, in which they agree with the Latins: who join the particle *Si, if,* not so much to the subjunctive, as to the indicative, as the example given shows, *si vales, bene est*: And for the words of the imperfect and pluperfect, they are supplied in the way, which we just described, at Numbers 112 and 113.

Although.

118. From each of these modes of the subjunctive, if the word ஆல் or இல், you add உம், you have the subjunctive with the particle *etiamsi, quamvis, although*: *e.g.* வந்தாலும், *although he is come;* செய்தானாகிலும், *although he has done it.* Of the word ஆனாலும் or ஆகிலும், however, I shall say more, when I treat of particles.

Since

119 (1) The particle *cûm, since*, provided it be not the preposition, whether it is joined to a subjunctive or not, is always expressed in this language by these words, போது, பொழுது, which signify time; or by these words அளவில், or இடத்தில், ablative, the first from the word அளவு, *a measure*; the second for the word இடம், *a place*; all which words are put after all participles, whether positive or negative. And although, of these words, the first two may signify time, yet they serve for the particle, *since*, even when this does not imply time, but cause; and is equivalent to the word *forasmuch as, whereas*. Thus நீயென் வார்த்தை மீறினபோது, பொழுது அடிப்படுவாய், *since thou hast been disobedient to me; thou shalt be beaten*: here the word *since* is the same as *whereas*. But in this proposition, வரும் போது, வருமளவில், நீயும் வா, *when or at the time at which, he shall come, do thou come also*, it implies time.

(2) They elegatly supply the subjunctive *since*, when it implies *cause*, by using the word of the infinitive of any verb, to which they add the infinitive from the verb, கொள்ளுகிறது, e g நீய் சொல்லக்கொள்ள, &c. *since thou sayest this*, or *because thou sayest this*, &c. And for the differences of tenses they add, ஆகக்கொள்ள, to the verbal of the participle of any tense, and say, நான் வருகிறதாகக் கொள்ள, *Since I am coming;* நான் வந்ததாகக் கொள்ள, *since I have now come*; நான் வருவதாகக் கொள்ள, *since I shall come, &c.*, which mode is very elegant.

The Ablative Absolute.

120. (1.) The mode just now in the first place described, serves also for the ablative absolute: thus, நீய் வரக் கொள்ள விவனும் வந்தான், *thee coming, he also comes.*

(2.) More elegantly they use for the ablative absolute the word of the infinitive simply, without கொள்ள: thus சுழற்காற்றடிக்கச் சுழன்றெழும் புழுதி, *a whilewind blowing the dust rises in round masses:* so சேவர் தூங்கியிருக்கச் சீஷாக்கள் வந்தார்கள், *the soldiers sleeping, the scholars have come, &c.*, and this way is the best.

(3.) The adlative in இல் from the varbal ஐ, is properly rendered by the ablative absolute: thus நானிருக்கையி லிப்படி பேசாதே, *me being present, thou mayest not talk in this manner.*

(4) The phrase by which the work செய்தே is added to any infinitive, used by some for the ablative absolute: thus நீய் போகச்செய்தே யவன் வந்தான், *thee departing, he came.* But this word செய்தே is nothing else than the gerund from the verb செய்கிறது, செய்து, to which is added the particle ê, which may with elegance be added to every word, as I shall explain below. Wherefore it is the same as if I said.. சொல்லச்செய்து, which composition may elegantly be made in every tense and person, especially if உம் be interposed; thus, நானவனுக் கிதைச் சொல்லவுஞ் செய்தே னெழுதவுஞ் செய்தேன், *this I have both said and written to him;* or சொல்லவுஞ் செய்வே னெழுதவுஞ் செய்வேன், *I will both say and write.* Whence

it is the same as if I said simply, சொன்னேன், சொல்வேன், & c. Wherefore this phrase also, சொல்லச்செய்தே is the same as சொல்லியே. So நான் சொல்லச்செய்தே செய்யாதே போனாய், and நான் சொல்லியே செய்யாதேபோனாய், harmonises together, and may be rendered by the ablative absolute, *me myself speaking, thou has not done it*. Still this phrase must by no means be used; because in opposition to the rule which I gave at number 71, the gerund comes in the nominative, different from that which governs the principal verb Some teach that instead of செய்தே, we may use the word சே, போகச்சே, வரச்சே, which however is altogether barbarous, and by the rule vulgar is introduced so foolishly, that you will ont find it prevail in any general use even among the common people.

Gerunds,

121. Th Gerund, of which see Number 71, as I have there stated, does not serve but for the Gerund in *do*: but for the Gerund in *di* or *dum,* they use the word of the Infinitive: thus, உன்னைக் காணவெனக் காசையுண்டு, *I have a desire* (*videndi*) *of seeing thee:* so கர்த்தர் நம்மை யிரட்சிக்க வந்தார். *The Lord came,* (*ad salvandum,*) *to save us.*

The Supine.

122. The Tamulians have no Supine. They supply the Supine in *u* by using the dative of the verbal of the participle dresent or future: thus, இது சொல்லுகிறதுக்கரிது, or more eegantly, இது சொல்வதற்கரிது, *this is difficult to*

be said, &c. That verbal may also come in the nominative, இது சொல்லுகிறதரிது, &c., Yet it does not in that case correspond with the Supine, but is the same as, *to say this, is difficult:* whence the word *this,* which in the first proposition was the nominative in the latter is the accusative, and it would be better Tamul to say, இதைச் சொல்லுகிற தரிது. They supply the Supine in *um,* by using the infinitive with a verb which implies motion to a place: சொல்லப் போறேன், *I go to say;* சொல்ல வந்தேன், *I have come to say.* Whence if to the infinitive of any verb you add the word from the verb போறது, *to go,* you have Paulò-post-future: thus சொல்லப் போறேன், *I go to say;* சொல்லப் போவாய், *thou shalt go to say, &c.*

Participles Future,

123. The Participle Future, which the Tamulians have, does not, as I have stated at Number 73, well correspond, with our Latin participle future in *rus:* for we cannot use it to express an end. Wherefore—

(1.) For the participle future in *rus,* when it implies an end, the Tamulians use the simple word of the Infinitive, which they use, as I have just stated, for the Supine in *um,* to which in Latin also this participle is equivalent: thus நாளை புஸ்தகமிதைக் கொடுக்க வருவேன், *tomorrow I will come, about to give this to thee.*

(2.) They supply the participle future passive in *dus,* by adding to the infinitive the word from the verb தகுகிறது, which implies suitableness or obligation, of which I have said more at Number 86. Thus இது செய்யத்

தகும், *this is to be done;* that is to say, either *it is meet to be done;* or *it ought to be done:* so, நீய் துதிக்கத் தகுவாய், *thou art to be praised:* so, சொல்லத்தக்க தெல்லாஞ் சொன்னேன், *I have said all things which were to be said &c.*

The Relative Who or Which.

124. The Tamulians are also without the relative, Who, or Which; still they so supply it, by means of participles and appellative nouns, as may be seen in what we have thus far said, that after a short experience this relative would be not at all missed. They have nevertheless the words of this relative, which serve for interrogation, as we stated at Number 47. எவன், *who?* (Masculine எவள், *who?* (Feminine) எது, *what?* (Neuter). They have also the word ஆர் or யார், *who?* (Masc. or Fem). This word at pleasure is either put after the verbal form participles, (which even if it be of the neuter gender, does not with this word, serve for the neuter, but for the masculine or feminine:) or it is also put after appellative nouns, which are formed from verbs: thus செய்கிறவனார், செய்தவனார், செய்பவனார், for the masculine; செய்கிறவளார், செய்தவளார், செய்பவளார், for the feminine: செய்கிறதார், செய்ததார், செய்வதார், for either: &c. Or that word ஆர், யார், is put before the said nouns appellative, or any word of a verb absolute: thus யார் செய்கிறவன், யார் செய்தவன், &c., யார் செய்வான், யார் செய்தான், &c., for in this way it is always united to the third person masculine. Finally this same word is substituted for the plural; thus வந்தவர்களாய், ஆர் வருவார்கள், &c.

Adverbs

125. In ihis language likewise there are in fact scarcely any Adverbs, if bou except Adverbs of place. For instance, இப்போது, *now*, அப்போது, *then*, எப்போது, *when?* இன்று, *to-day*, நேற்று, *yesterday*, நாளை, *to-morrow*, &c., are not in truth Adverbs, but noun absolute, which are declined through the case: and the first are from the noun போது, *time*, with இ, அ, எ, which particles correspond to the articles, *this, that, which;* as we said at Number 50. But adverbs are easily formed, or, to speak more correctly, the want of them is supplied, in this language by adding for instance to any noun, either the gerund ஆய், or the infinitive ஆக, from the verb ஆகிறது, *to be made*. Thus சந்தோஷம், *joy*, comes சந்தோஷமாய், or சந்தோஷமாக, *joyfully;* from கோபம், *anger*, comes கோபமாய் or கோபமாக, *angrily*, &c. For since ஆய் is the gerund from the verb *fieri*, which in Latin wants the gerund, it may be expressed by the participle *factus, made*, and *e.g.* சந்தோஷமாய் வந்தான் be rendered, *joy being made he came*, that is *he came joyfully*. So when, as I have stated above, they elegantly use the infinitive in the manner of the ablative absolute, adverbs are formed by adding the infinitive ஆக. More over they use this particular infinitive ஆக, as I shall mention hereafter to express the mode in which anything is done: thus *e.g.* I may render தூதனாக வந்தான், *he came in the manner of an ambassador*, &c. Whence when it is said, *e g.* கோபமாகச் சொன்னான், the meaning is, *he spoke in the manner of anger, i.e. angrily;* whence these phrases may will be reduced to adverbs.

SECTION—IV

Of the Composition of Verbs.

126. The Tamulians have not verbs compounded in the manner of the Latins, from any preposition or particle; as *adsum, to be present; respicio, to look back; protraho, to draw forward,* &c., but they elegantly compound together many verbs, by uniting for instance one verb with the gerund in *do* of another: the former is conjugated, and the signification is taken from the gerund. I will here adduce a few verbs, which are more frequently wont to be united to gerunds, and to serve for the composition of verbs. Of which let the first be the verb.

இருக்கிறது.

This may be united to the gerund of any verb, whether active or passive; whether positive or negative: and may be expressed, செய்திருக்க, செய்யப்பட்டிருக்க, செய்யாதிருக்க &c. Some think that the verb compounded by this union differs in nothing from the simple verbs, and in the same way they explain *e g.* அடித்தான் and அடித்திருந்தான்: yet the difference is at least as great, as that of the praeterite and future from the aorists of the Greeks. But that this may appear clearly;-if to the gerund அடித்து, from the verb அடிக்கிறது, *to strike through.* I add the verb இருக்கிறது, this may be conjugated through its tenses, and these there propositions may be made; *e g* first, நாயனுன்னை யடித்திருக்கிறான்; second நாயனுன்னை யடித்திருந்தான்; third நாயனுன்னை

யடித்திருப்பான். Of these the first supposes past time in the action of striking, from time in which this is said; and implies the present time of the co-existence of the person striking with the speaker; so that if Peter now strikes you, I can by no means say, ராயனுன்னை யடித்திருக்கிறான்; but I may say by the word of the simple present, அடிக்கிறான். Again if Peter, before the time at which I am speaking, has stricken you, but he is now not in existence, but dead; I cannot now say, உன்னை யடித்திருக்கிறான், but I must say, அடித்திருந்தான். But this second proposition implies post time in the striking, from the time, not only in which I am speaking, but also of which I am speaking: for if Peter struck you yesterday, I cannot say, நேற்று ராயனுன்னை யடித்திருந்தான்; but by the simple word of the praeterite, அடித்தான்; and that அடித்திருந்தான், signifies, that he struck you before the period laid down in my proposition, namely, before yesterday, whether years or days may have preceded. Finally, the third proposition அடித்திருப்பான், imples indeed time future in the striking, from the time of which I speak. Thus if I wish to say, *Peter will strike you on the tenth day*, I cannot say, ராயனுன்னை பத்தாநாளடித்திருப்பான்; but I may say by the word of the simple future, அடிப்பான். But if I should day, அடித்திருப்பான், it signifies, that after the time indeed in which I am speaking, but before the tenth day, of which I speak in the proposition, he will srike you: and it is the same, as if I said, *within ten days he will strike you*.

Whence this proposition is compounded of the praeterite. and future, as in Latin, *factum erit, it will have been done,* which differs sufficiently from *fiet, it will be done.* The second proposition implies a donble praeterition, as in Latin, *factum fuit, it hath been done,* which differs from *factum est, it is done* Finally, the first proposition is compounded of the praeterite and the present, of which in Latin I do not find in fact any example. The first and second propositions have reference to past time, since both imply past time in the action from the time in which I speak Whence this language reckons three praeterites, *e.g.* அடித்தேன், அடித்திருக்கிறேன், அடித்திருந்தேன். But the third proposition, since it implies time future from the time in which I speak, has reference to the future; and if you add the paulò-post-future from the Supine, (of which we spoke above at Number 122,) they reckon also three futures, அடிப்பேன், அடிக்கப்போறேன், அடித்திருப்பேன்.

ஆயிருக்கிறது.

127. This special compound, since the verb இருக்கிறது is united with the gerund ஆய் from the verb ஆகிறது, *to be made,* does not always retain the signification of the gerund: கர்த்தர் மனுஷனாயிருக்கிறார், is indeed properly rendered, *the Lord was made man.* But this phrase is very frequently used for the verb, *to have:* thus சந்தோஷமாயிருக்கிறேன், is, *I have joy.* In which sense however I cannot always use this phrase; for in order to say, *thou hast cows,* I may certainly not say, மாடாயிருக்கிறாய், Wherefore I can only use this phrase from the verb *to have,* when it can also be rendered in Latin by *sum, es, est,* I *am, &c.,* with an adjective. Thus *I have joy,* may be ren-

dered, *I am joyful*; thus வியாதியா யிருக்கிறேன், *i have infirmity*, or, *I am infirm*, &c. Whence the said phrase more frequently signifies simply the same as *sum, es, est, I am, thou art*, &c: in which sense however it sometimes admits the gerund ஆய், sometimes not: for which let this be the rule. If *sum, es, est,* the verb *to be*, is constructed with two nominative, then to that nominative which is the praedicate in the proposition, ஆய் is added: thus, *God is good*, is expressed சறுவேசுவரன் நல்லவராயிருக்கிறார், &c.

But if the verb *sum, to be*, is construed either with a dative, or simply with only one nominative: then, since there is really no praedicate in the proposition, ஆய் is not added. Thus, *this infirmity is to me*, (I have this infirmity), is expressed, எனக்கிந்த வியாதி யிருக்கிறது: so, *there will be water there*, is expressed, அங்கே தண்ணீருக்கும், &c. Whence, when it is doubted whether or not ஆய் is to be added to any noun, you can see whether that noun be the praedicate in the proposition: and if it is you add it: but if it be the subject, the contrary. This can also be explained by another rule: if the verb, *sum, to be*, expreses existence, ஆய் is not added: if it implies essence, if is added. Thus, if I say, *the men of this town are stupid;* the verb *are* expresses their essence and quality; whence adding ஆய், I may say, இந்த ஊரார் மடையராயிருக்கிறார்கள். If however I say, *stupid mean are in this town;* the verb *are*, implies not the essence, but the existence of the stupid men: whence without adding the ஆய், I may say இந்த ஊரிலே மடையரிருக்கிறார்கள், &c.

கொள்ளுகிறது, போடுகிறது.

128. Often to the gerund of another verb they add the verb கொள்ளுகிறது, or போடுகிறது, with this distinction. If the verb implies action, which has reference to another than the agent, போடுகிறது, may be added, but not கொள்ளுகிறது; and on the contrary this may be added, and not that, if it implies an action which has reference to the agent himself: *e.g.* எழுதுகிறது, *to write*. Anyone can write for himself, that, *e g.* he may retain to himself the book written; and then கொள்ளுகிறது is properly added. Thus, எழுதிக் கொண்டேன்; in which proposition, although எனக்கு, *to me*, does not occur, it is manifestly collected from the verb கொண்டேன், and it must be rendered, *I have written for myself*. But if I have written, in order that I may give the writing to another, I cannot add கொள்ளுகிறது; but even if I do not explain for when I have written, still by the addition of the word from the verb போடுகிறது, as எழுதிப் போட்டேன், it will be manifest, that I have written not for myself, but for another. From this same reson, I have sent, *e.g.* a person who may call Pater, and I say to him whom I had sent, on this return, hast thou called him? then, If after calling Peter, he has returned alone, he well answer, அழைத்தேன், *I have called him*: but if Peter also, whom he had called, has come with him, he may say அழைத்துக் கொண்டேன்; as if he would say, *I have so called him, that I have brought him with me*. Sometimes however கொள்ளுகிறது, is added for the simple elegance of the phrase; never however to those verbs which imply action

with reference to another. Thus it is said பாடிக்கொண்டேன், *I have sung:* ஆடிக்கொண்டேன், *I have led the dances,* &c. But when to a gerund of one verb there is added to gerund கொண்டு, from the verb கொள்ளுகிறது, and the verb வருகிறது; it signifies the continuance of the action which is expressed by the first gerund. Thus, சொல்லிக்கொண்டு வந்தேன், is not simply *I have said:* but *I have continued to say often and often.* So, பிட்சை கொடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிறது, is not simply, *to give alms, but to be in the habit of giving them frequently*: &c.

படுகிறது,

129. When speaking of the Passive voice, at Number 77, I have already stated the verbs become passive, if the verb படுகிறது, which means *to suffer,* is added to their infinitive. I now add, that by the addition of this verb to any noun, especially one which implies any passion of the mind or body, there is formed a compound verb with a signification either passive, or, at least, neuter; in which composition, if the noun ends in ம, this becomes lost, and ப is always doubled. Thus from பயம், *fear,* comes பயப்படுகிறது, *to fear:* from அழுக்கு, *filth,* comes அழுக்குப்படுகிறது, *to be filthy;* from அடி *a blow,* comes அடிப்படுகிறது, *to be beaten;* from ஒரு, *one,* comes ஒருப்படுகிறது, *from many to become one,* &c. And all these have an active sense, if instead of adding படுகிறது, there be added its adjective படுத்துகிறது. So, from வெளி, *an open place,* comes வெளிப்படுகிறது, *to be opened, to be manifested;* and வெளிப்படுத்துகிறது, *to open, to manifest.* So, ஒருப்

படுக்குகிறது, *from many to make one*: so, பயப்படுத்து கிறது, *to strike with fear*, &c. Those however which are numeral nouns, and end in ம், as எல்லாம், ஆயிரம், &c., do not lose ம் before படுகிறது. Hence it is said, படாத தெல்லாம் பட்டேன்: so அடிகளாயிரம் பட்டேன், &c. Except also காயம், *a wound*; since although in fact it may, omitting ம், be said காயப்பட்டேன்; still, since this mode is equivocal, whether it comes? from the noun காயம், or from the infinitive of the verb காய்கிறது; in order to do away the equivocation, if it is from this verb, we say காயப்பட்டது, *it is dried up*; but if from the noun காயம், we say காயம்பட்டது, *it is wounded*, &c. Observe, however, that in all these, there does not occur a proper composition from these nouns and the verb படுகிறது; but this is united to the noun in its own proper signification, which is, *to suffer*: whence பயப்படுகிறது, means, *to suffer fear*, அடிப்படுகிறது, *to suffer blows*, &c.

ஒட்டுகிறது.

130. This verb, besides other significations, means *to permit, to allow*: but we use it with the infinitive of another verb, without alteration, and then it cannot in fact be called a compound verb. Thus என்னைப் பிழைக்கவொட்டான், *he does not allow me to live*, &c., and this method is the more elegant. Still the practice has prevailed, that, a syncope or contraction taking place, the ā final is lost from the word of the infinitive, and it becomes one verb compounded with the verb ஒட்டுகிறது, and they say, பிழைக்கொட்டான், பேசவொட்டான், &c., *he does not allow to*

live, he does not allow to depart, &c. For which observe this one thing, that in all other words, the ā final of the infinitive, as I have said, is lost; but in the word of the imperative positive ஒட்டு, the *a* of the infinitive remaining, *o* is lost, from the word ஒட்டு: and although in the imperative also of the negative we may say, பிழைக்கொட்டாதே, *do not thou allow to live;* yet we do say, பிழைக்கட்டு, செய்யட்டு, *allow to live, allow to do,* &c.

அருளுகிறது, &c.

131. The verb அருளுகிறது, besides other meanings, signifies *to exercise pity, to behave compassionately*; whence in composition with the gerund of another verb, it is well explained by the verb, to *vouchsafe*. Whence they use this composition, when they speak of persons very dignified: thus எழுந்தருளினார், *he arose,* or *he deigned to rise;* so தந்தருளினார், *he deigned to give,* &c. Moreover the Tamulians are accustomed to add other verbs to gerunds, by which composition, no addition is made to the signification of the simple verb. But they add either போறது; thus, அது வந்து போச்சு, and it does not signify, *that by coming departed,* but simply, *came,* &c. They add இடுகிறது, or விடுகிறது: thus, திறந்திட்டேன், or திறந்துவிட்டேன், *I have opened;* and others of this sort, which practice will teach you

Verbs of Command

132. Finally the Tamulians from every verb from another, which they call ஏவல் வினை, as if they would say, a

verb of command: forasmuch as in this way are formed the verbs, which imply an action which is done by the command, or at least by the persuasion of that person who comes in the nominative. They are formed in this manner! from the word of the future, பேன், comes பிக்கிறது; and from the word வேன், comes விக்கிறது; and they are conjugated according to the general rules: In the praeterite they have த்தேன், in the future ப்பேன். Thus *e.g.* from அடிப்பேன், comes அடிப்பிக்கிறேன், அடிப்பித்தேன், அடிப்பிப்பேன், &c., and it signifies, that I do not strike by my own self indeed; but by means of another, who strikes another by my command or persuasion, I am said to strike him: whence it must be rendered, *I cause that he strikes; I caused that he struck,* &c. Thus from செய்வேன், comes செய்விக்கிறேன், செய்வித்தேன், செய்விப்பேன், and it signifies, that I indeed do not work, but by command and persuasion, *I cause that another, works; I caused that another worked,* &c. Observe that those which in the future have *u* before வேன், change this into *i*, and have இவிக்கிறது; thus from சொல்லுவேன், comes சொல்விக்கிறது; from மயக்குவேன், come மயக்கிவிக்கிறது; from பண்ணுவேன், comes பண்ணிவிக்கிறது, &c. Those however which before வேன் have only two short syllables, without an intermediate double consonant do not change *u*: thus from வருவேன், comes வருவிக்கிறது; from விடுவேன், விடுவிக்கிறது; from அழுவேன், அழுவிக்கிறது, &c. And thus much of verbs compounded.

SECTION IV

Of the use of the Infinitive

133. The Tamulians use the word of the Infinitive very elegantly: the chief uses I shall give here. And

1. It is equivalent entirely to the Infinitive of the Latins, *credere, to believe, amare, to love,* &c. Nevertheless the Tamulians do not always use the infinitive after the verbs often as the Latins do; for which this may serve as a rule. If the Latin sentence, which has the Infinitive after the verb, may be rendered either into French or Portuguese, without the word *que,* but may be rendered either by the simple infinitive, or by the particles *de* or á, then in Tamul we always use the Infinitive. Thus Latin, *volo facere, I wish to do;* French *je veux faire;* Portuguese *quero fazer;* நான் செய்யவேணும். So L. *cupis facere, I desire to do;* F. *je desire de faire;* P. *desejo de fazer;* T. செய்ய விரும்புகிறேன். So L. *incipio facere, I begin to do;* F. *je commence de faire;* P. *principio* á *fazer;* T. செய்யத் துவக்கினேன். But if the infinitive of the Latins is rendered by the French or Portuguese by *que:* then in Tamul we do not use the Infinitive, but after the manner of the French and Portuguese phrase, in place of that *que* is put என்று, the gerund from the verb என்கிறது; and the verb which in the Latin phrase is expressed by the infinitive, comes here by tense and person, according to the exigence of the sentence. Thus, L. *te venisse dixit, he said that thou hadst come;* F. *il dit, que tu ètois venu;* P. *disse, que tu tinhas vindo;* T. நீர் வந்தாரென்று சொன்னார், &c. In this last sense

this language elegantly uses the verbal from the participles: *e.g.* வருகிறது, வந்தது, வருவது, which, without the word என்று, is either used in the accusative; thus நீய் வந்ததைச் சொன்னான், &c ; or even, which is still more elegant, the infinitive ஆக is added to that verbal: thus நீய் வந்ததாகச் சொன்னான், *he said that thou hadst come* So அவர்கள் வருவார்களென்று சொன்னான், or அவர்கள் வருவதைச் சொன்னான், or, more elegantly, அவர்கள் வருவதாகச் சொன்னான், *he said that they were about to come,* &c.

134. 2. But when the *que* in Portuguess and French is rendered in Latin, not by the infinitive, but by the subjunctive *ut that;* then in Tamul we elegantly use the infinitive: thus *dic, ut veniat, say that he may come,* வரச்சொல்லு, &c. Hence when in Latin you may with more elegance say, *desidero, ut veniat I desire that he may come,* than, *illum venire, him to come*: and *necesse est, ut veniat, it is necessary that he may come,* better than, *illum venire,* &c., these propositions may be rendered in Tamul by the infinitive: அவன் வர விரும்புகிறேன், அவன் வர வேண்டியது, &c. Wherefore the second use of the infinitive is to express the subjunctive *ut, that,*

3. They use the infinitive elegantly, as the Latins by the figure of ellipsis, when the verb *incipio, to begin,* &c. beipg omitted, they elegantly fill the sentence, by a crowded series of infinitives: *e.g. extensae apparere nubes, undique obscurari caelum, fujgura micare, mugire tonitrua,* &c., *the clouds* (began) *to appear spred out, the sky on all sides to*

be obscured, the lightnings to flash, the thunders to roar, &c. So I might in Tamul elegantly say; மேகங்களெழுந்து படர, மூடின வானமெங்கு மிருள, மேகங்களைப் பிளந்தாற்போல மின்னல்கள் விளங்கி மின்ன, விடிகளிடித்து முழங்க, நாற்றிசை யிலுங் காற்றெழும்பி யதிர்ந்து வீச, த்திரளாயிடைவிடாமல் மழை பொழிந்து பெய்யப், பெய்த மழை திரண்டு வெள்ளமோடி யாறுகளுங் குளங்களு நிறைய வுயிர்களெல்லா மகிழ்ந்து வாழ, &c. The Tamulians very often even in familiar use elegantly speak in this way.

136. 4. Sometimes in Tamul we use infinitive of some verbs in the manner of on adverb. Thus from ஆகிறது, comes ஆக, *together*; from முந்துகிறது, comes முந்த, *before*: so from திரும்புகிறது, திரும்ப, திரும்பவும், *again*; from மீளுகிறது, மீளவும், *again*; from மிகுகிறது, மிக or மிகவும், *abundantly; increasingly;* from நிறைகிறது, நிறைய, *fully*; from ஒக்கிறது ஒக்க, *together;* and others of this sort, of which I seall give more below, beginning at Number 168.

137 5. But if we use the same infinitive repeated, as பேசப் பேசப் போகப் போக, &c, then it is put for the gerund in *do*. when this implies continuance and cause; as when we say, *fabricando fit faber, by working one becomes a workman*; for this proposition signifies that by continuance of working, as by a cause, one becomes a workman. So in Tamul, *e.g.* பேசப் பேசவெந்த பாஷையும் வரும், *by talking every languag e is learnt, i e.* by continuance of talking, as by a cause any language is learnt. So they say, எறும்பு

நடக்க நடக்கக் கல்லுங் குழியாகும், which may be rendered according to our proverb, *the ant hollows the stone by going not twice, but often*. Hence நாளப் போகப் போக, means, *by the course of time*, &c.

138. 6. Tee Tamulians oftentimes, by adding to the word of the infinitive the interrogative particle ஓ, use the infinitive for the first person of the future, in the way of one asking permission, or of using threats to another. Thus அடிக்கவோ is அடிப்பேனோ, that is to say, either by asking permission to strike another, or by threatening that I will strike him whom I address. Or sometimes also it answers to this proposition, *what can I strike?* that I may express, certainly I am unwilling to strike, or I am unable to strike, &c., in which way they often and very elegantly use the word of the infinitive in this language.

139. Finally that all the uses of the Infinitive may be seen, I will just touch here, what I have explained above. Wherefore,

7. They use the Infinitive for the Imperative; number 69.

8. For the Optative with கடவது; number 114.

9. For the Ablative Absolute; number 191.

10. For the Gerunds in *di* and *dum;* number 121.

11. For the Supine in *um;* number 122.

12. For the Participle Future in *rus;* number 123.

ஆக.

140. This particular Infinitive, ஆக, from the verb ஆகிறது, besides the said twelve uses, common to all verbs, admits of others. And,

1. It expresses elegantly what we imply in Latin by *sponte, ex se ipso, voluntarily*: *e.g.* one has made a statue of a horse, which, by machinery artfully composed within, runs leaping, of itself, no one impelling it I might express this by the Ablative தன்னாலே, which in fact does express, *of itself*. Yet it will be more elegant to say, தானகத் துள்ளியோடும், &C. So a young child does something above its age; I ask, *did he do this voluntarily of himself, or another telling him?* I render this in Tamul, இதைத்தானகச் செய்தானோ வேறொருவன் சொல்லச் செய்தானோ, &C I might indeed say, தானே செய்தானோ, &C., but தானே is liable to ambiguity, since it may also mean, that he himself did it and not another, or he did it by himself, or another impelling him.

141. 2. We have said above, that ஆக is taken for *simul, together*. In this sense, after I have enumerated many things separately, (which is expressed in Tamul by வகை சொல்லுகிறது,) if I wish to put them together in one and speak of them in one number, (which the Tamulians call, தொகை சொல்லுகிறது,) then I may use the word ஆக; *e g* I bought five oxen, three cows, eleven sheep, and seven goats, *which united together, are twenty-six heads*: his last I may express in Tamul, ஆகத் தலை யிருபத்தாறு, &C.

142. 3. ஆக, signifies *in the manner, in the quality*, *as:* thus ஒட்டோலகனாக வந்தார், *he became in the manner of one trium-phing;* தூதனாக வந்தான், *he came in the quality of a legate:* சூரியனாக விளங்கி யெழுந்தருளினார், *he rose shining as the sun,* &C.

143. 4. If ஆக be united to the noun இடம், *a place*, it is the same as, *for, in place of* another and requires a dative, sometimes a genitive; or is even joined to the nominative: thus, அங்கே போறத்துக் கிடமாக விங்கே வந்தான், *in place of going thither, he came hither:* so என்னிடமாக நீய்போ, *do thou go for me, or in place of me:* so விலையிடமாகவிருந்து தந்தான், *he gave a dinner for pay,* &C. They very often in this sense use the simple infinitive ஆக, without இடம், which is yet more elegant: thus விலையாக விருந்து தந்தான்; so கேடையமாக விசுவாசத்தைக் கொண்டிருந்தான், *he had faith for a shield* &C.

144. 5. ஆக signifies also, *that it may profit, on account of,* and requires a dative: thus உனக்காகச் செய்வேன், *I will do it that it may profit thee, on account of thee.* Hence it appears, how ill some say, *e. g.* பாவங்களுக்காகவழு, when they ought to say பாவங்களாலழு, But the verb ஆகிறது, in whatever tense, admits of this signification: thus இந்த வியாதிக்கிதாகுமோ, *will this benefit this infirmity?*

கொள்ள.

145. The Infinitive கொள்ள also from the verb கொள்ளுகிறது, has a special use besides the common ones: for instance being added to the infinitive of another verb, it

implies cause. and is elegantly taken for *because seeing that*. Thus பாவியாய் நடக்கக்கொள்ள அவலமாய்க் கெடுவான், *because he live badly, he will perish badly*: so காலமே யவன் வந்ததாகக்கொள்ள, *because he comes in the very early morning*; &c. So நாளை வருவதாகக் கொள்ள, *because he will come to-morrow*, &c. Whence, as appears from the examples adduced according to the difference of times, we elegantly use verbals of participles, of whatever tense, with the infinitive ஆக, to which is added this other infinitive கொள்ள. All which I might indeed express by the Ablative of the cause, by saying, நடக்கிறதினாலே, வந்ததினாலே, வருவதினாலே, &c.; but to use this infinitive, in the manner now stated, is far more elegant.

146. Finally, to complete what I have here delivered regarding the Syntax of the verbs, I will add somewhat as to the use and meaning of some verbs. And

1. These two verbs வாங்கிறது, and கொடுக்கிறது, *to receive*, and *to give*, have such mutual reference to each other that I cannot use the first, without taking something from one who can give it with his hands: nor can I use this second, without giving to one who is able to receive it with his hands. Thus if I wish to say, *receive the money which is in that chest*: I cannot use the verb வாங்கிறது, since you ought not to receive it from the hands of another; but I ought to use the verb எடுக்கிறது, *to take, to lift*; thus அந்தப் பெட்டியிலிருக்கும் பணங்களை யெடு &c. But if I say, *he will go that he may receive that from Peter*: then I shall with propriety use the verb வாங்கிறது.

since that is to be received from the hands of Peter; ராயன் கிட்ட, or ராயன் கையிலே யதை வாங்கப்போவான், &c. So, to say, *give grass to the horse*, since the horse has no hands, with which he may receive the grass, I cannot use the verb கொடுக்கிறது; but I may use the verb போடு கிறது, *to throw;* thus குதிரைக்குப் புல்லுப்போடு, *throw grass th the horse*. But I may well say, செட்டிக்குப் பணங் கொடு, *give the money to the merchant*, since he has hands, with which he may receive it, &c.

2. தருகிறது and கொடுக்கிறது, both signify *to give*. So, வருகிறது and செல்லுகிறது, both signify *to come, to arrive at:* although this last has other meanings also. These four verbs however in use differ from each other; all indiscriminately serve with respect to the third person: *e g* அவனுக்குப் பணங்களைத் தந்தேன், or கொடுத் தேன் *I gave money to him;* so பணமவனுக்கு வந்தது, or, சென்றது, *money came to him* But with respect to the first or second person, the Grammar of the Tamulians teaches. that we cannot use the verb கொடுக்கிறது, nor செல்லு கிறது, but that we ought to use the verb தருகிறது, and வருகிறது: thus it is barbarous to say, எனக்கு, or உனக் குப் பணங்களைக் கொடுத்தான், or பணமெனக்கு, or உனக்குச் சென்றது: but we must say, எனக்கு or உனக்குப் பணங் களைத் தந்தான், *he gave money to me or to thee*. So we must say, பணமெனக்கு, or உனக்குவந்தது, *money came to me* or *to thee*, &c. Moreover the same grammar teaches that these three words, ஈய, தா, கொடு, which all correspond to this word, *give*, so differ one from the other, that ஈய,

may be the word of asking a superior: தா, may be the word of requesting from an equal; கொடு may be the word of commanding to an inferior. I know that this distinction is not commonly well observed, but I have thought that what is a precept of the learned, should not be passed over.

SECTION VI

Of certain Particles of the Tamul Language

147. The Tamulians call Particles இடைச்சொல்: as if they said, *a word intermediate in a sentence*. But since in every idiom, particles unite and adorn a sentence, as gold does gems, I have resolved here to offer a few observations concerning particles, and other words, which the Tamulians use like particles. Of which let the first be

உம்.

This particle (1.) is equivalent to the conjunction *and*; and it is added either each or to none of these which are counted: *e.g.* இவனுமவனும் வந்தார்கள், and not இவனவனும் வந்தார்கள். But when உம் occurs with a negation following, it is used for *nec, nor*, as we shall describe below, and then to many things reckoned without any conjunction, உம், is well added once at the end: *e.g* வெயில் குளிர் காற்று மழை பசி தாகமு மஞ்சாதிருந்தான், as if I should say, *the sun, cold, wind, rain, hunger, thirst, nor calamities of this kind did he fear*, &c.

(2.) When I distinguish the number from the thing numbered, and do not say, *e.g. two oxen*, but *these two are oxen*, உம் must be added: thus இதுகளிரண்டு மெருது, and not, இரண்டெருது; for this means, *two oxen*.

(3.) When the number which is expressed is complete, உம் is to be added: *e.g.* if I say, *one of my eyes aches*, this is not the perfect number, since I have two

eyes; hence, without adding உம், I may say, எனக்கொரு கண் நோகுது. But if each aches, உம் must be added: thus எனக்கிரண்டு கண்ணும் or கண்ணிரண்டும் நோகுது: and if I did not add உம் here, it would seem to be supposed that I have yet a third eye Thus if I say, இந்த விரண்டு மாடெனது, *these two oxen are mine*; since I have not added உம், it is understood that there are still more oxen there; but if only these two which are mine were there, adding உம் I ought to have said, இந்த விரண்டு மாடுமெனது, &c.

(4.) உம் is often the same as in Latin, *quoque, also*, or *vel* which is taken for *etiam even*: thus நீயு மென் மகனே, *thou also, my son*. Hence if to the word ஒன்று, which means *one*, you add உம், and a negation follows, it is the same as *nothing*: thus ஒன்றுஞ் செய்யேன், *nothing will I do*; for it is as if I said, *I will not do even one thing*: so தண்ணீருங் கொடான் *he will not give even water*, &c.

(5.) Hence உம், with a negation following, is equivalent to our *nor*: thus நானுஞ் செய்யேன், *nor will I doit*; so நன்று மல்லத் தீது மல்ல, *nor good, nor bad*.

(6.) If you add உம், to words of uncertainty it conveys an universal sense: thus எங்கு, *where?* எங்கும், *every where*; யார், *who?* யாரும், *all*: எப்படி, *how?* எப்படியும், *anyhow*: எப்பொது. *when?* எப்போதும், *always*, &c. The same haypens, if, to the same words of uncertainty, you add the word of the subjunctive *although*, of which see number 118; thus, எங்கே போனாலும், *whithersoever he has gone*; எப்படிச் செய்தாலும், *however he has done*.

ஓ

148. This second particle which is long, is,

(1.) a word of interrogation and in a sentence is added to the word by which is expressed that, of which being in doubt, we make inquiry: e g I doubt whether one has given money to me; I may say, நீயெனக்குப் பணந் தந்தாயோ. But if, being sure about the giving of the money, I doubt whether the coins were ten or not; then ஓ ought not to be added to the verb தந்தாய், since of this I do not doubt; but it ought to be added to the word of the coins, about which I do doubt how many they are: நீயெனக்குப் பத்துப் பணமோ தந்தாய். But if, being sure about the delivery and the number of the mony, I doubt only whether he gave it to me, or to another; I may add ஓ to the word *to me*. நீ யெனக்கோ பத்துப் பணந் தந்தாய். Finally, if I am also certain that I received such money, but doubt from whom I received it ஓ is added to the word *thou*: நீயோ வெனக்குப் பத்துப் பணந் தந்தாய், &c So in Latin also we say, *tu mihi pecuniam* dedistine? or, *tu mihi* decemne *nummos dedisti?* or, *tu* mihine *decem nummos dedisti?* or finally, tune *dedisti mihi decem nummos?* Did you *give money to me?* or, *did you give me ten pieces?* or *did you give ten pieces to* me? or finally, *did you give ten pieces to* me? or finally, *did you give me ten pieces?* which certainly differ some what from each other.

(2) If to the particle ஓ you add என்றால், or என்னில், (each word being the subjunctive *if* from the verb என்கிறது, *to say*), thus, *e g.* அவனோ வென்றால், or அவனோ

வென்னில், means, *if you say, aveno*; that is, if you ask of him, *has he done? has he said?* &C. Whence this phrase corresponds to the Latin word, *at, verò autem* (*but*): and I may render it, *at ille* or *ille verò* or *ille autem*, &C. *but he*.

(3) If you add ஒ to the word ஆல், of the subjunctive *if*, it expresses some moral necessity of that means to that end, and is the same as, *not otherwise than; e g. If, all being left, thou hast followed Christ, thou shalt be saved*. Since any one, retaining all things, if he have kept the commandments, may well be saved: wherefore to this proposition I cannot add ஒ, and say எல்லாத்தையுந் துறந்து யேசுநாதரைப் பின்சென்றாலோ கரையேறுவாய் But since it is necessary to salvation to observe the divine commands, I may well add ஒ, and say, வேதகற்பினையின் படியே நடந்தாலோ கரையேறுவாய்; in which proposition is included this other, if thou hast not observed them thou canst not be saved: whence it is well rendered *not otherwise than by observing the divine commands, shalt thou be saved*. Thus அவன் வந்தாலோ செயமாகும், *not otherwise than by his coming, will victory appear*. In this sense, and in this same way, they use the words அன்றோ, அல்லோ, அல்லவோ; which words harmonise with, *is it not?*

(4.) They often use ஒ for negation, as sometimes we also use the form of interrogation, while certainly we do not expect an answer, but intend to deny emphatically: thus, நானோ சொன்னேன், *did I say it? i e I did not say it*.

(5) Sometimes they use ஓ for the conjunction *and*, when they mean to express increase and hyperbole. Thus one narrating the pageantry of a feast will say அதிலே கூடின மனுஷரோ, வந்த குதிரைகளோ, யானைகளோ, கோவிலிலே விழுந்த காணிக்கைகளோ, விரித்த பட்டுகளோ, வைத்த உடைமைகளோ, குவித்த மலர்களோ, செய்த சிறப்புகளோ, விதெல்லா மெவராலுஞ் சொல்லத்தகுந் தன்மையல்ல, &c.

(6.) If after ஓ, you add a word, which is equivalent to the verb *not to know*, or *to doubt*; then ஓ is the same as *whether*: thus வருவானோ தெரியாது, *whether he will come, I know not;* அவனோ சந்தேகம், *it is doubtful, whether it is he;* செற்றானோ வறியேன் *whether he is dead, I know not;* and then என்று is not added as appears in the sxmples adduced. If however there follows a verb, which signifies something else than *not to know*, or *to doubt*, we use this same phrase in the same sense; என்று however must be added: thus வந்தானோ வென்று கேள். *inquire, whether he has come now:* அவனோ வென்று சொல்லு, *say whether it is he* &c.

(7.) The Tamulians, as we have stated, besides ஓ, have words, which, of themselves, are interrogatives: e g. ஆர் *who?* எப்படி *how?* எங்கே, *where?* But if by adding Interrogation to interrogation, yo add ஓ to these words, they are no longer words of interrogation, but of ignorance: thus ஆரோ, *I know not, who he may be;* அவனெங்கேயோ, *I know not, where he may be,* &c. அறியேன், *I know not,* may indeed be added: but even though it be

not added, it is sufficiently clearly understood: thus ஆரோ வொருவன் வந்தான், *some one has come, I know not who he may be,*

(8.) Finally, ஓ may sometimes be put at the beginning of a sentence, and then it is better doubled, ஓஓ; and thus it expresses admiration with joy, or the idea of scoffing greatly: *e.g* I see a man wailing, I ask the cause, and he relates trifles, for which he absurdly laments; I may say ஓஓ இதுக்கோ வழுகிறாய், *O! dost thou wail for this?*

ஏ

149. This particle ஏ, which is long, is never found by itself at the end of a word in the Tamul language, but always is added, and at pleasure may be every where added or taken away.

And 1 They use this particle to express a kind of certainty and force, which can hardly be explained. It is added however to the word on which we intend to lay the stress, nearly in the same way in which we have described the particle ஓ to be added to the word, by which we express that of which we doubt; thus நீ யெனக்கிதைச் சொன்னாயே, I lay the stress on the act of speaking, as if I said, *thou saidst indeed this to me;* நீ யெனக் கிதையே சொன் னாய் *thou saidst this very thing to me;* நீ யெனக்கே யிதைச் சொன்னாய், *to me myself didst thou say this;* நீயே யெனக் கிதைச் சொன்னாய், *thou thyself saidst this to me,* &c.

2. They use this particle, to distinguish, markedly, one from many: Many apples *e.g.* hang from a tree; I seek one. they bring one which I do not wish for; I reject that, and showing the other with my finger, I say, இதே யறுத்துத் தா; which I could not say, if there were only one.

3. ஏ is elegantly added to any word expressive of a person groaning, or lamenting: thus, ஐயோ கெட்டேனே: என் மக னந்தோ விறந்து பட்டானே: உயிராதவனாய் நின்ற வொரு பிள்ளை யிழந்தேனே, *alas I am undone? Alas. me, my son is dead! I have lost my only son, the stay of my life!*

4. Sometimes this particle adds nothing to the word to which is joined; as when it is added to Ablatives, as in its proper place I have stated: முகத்திலே, முகத்தினாலே, முகத்திலோடே, &c Wherefore the learned in this language almost never add ē to these Ablatives, at least in their books.

ஐயோ, அன்றோ, ஏன், ஆக்கும்.

150. 1. ஐயோ, or ஐயையோ, or அந்தோ, are interjections of grieving or compassionating, which are used alone by themselves, and require no case. ஆ also especially, doubled in this way ஆஅ is an interjection of compassion; thus ஆஅ செத்தான், *ah! he is dead.* &c

2. அன்றோ, or அல்லோ, or அல்லவோ, agrees with *nonne? not?* இவனல்லோ சொன்னான், *did not he himself say it?* But these particles are added to the word on which we wish to place the stress as we said of ஓ

3. ஏன் ēn, is the same as *why?* It may be put before or after the verb, with this distinction: if it is placed before it, the verb is used in person, number and tense, according to the exigence of the sentence; thus ஏன் வந்தாய், *why hast thou come?* ஏன் வருகிறாள், *wherefore came she?* ஏன் வருவீர்கள், *why will you come?* But if this particle is put after it, the word of the third person masculine of the future tense, வருவான், இருப்பான், &c., is used for every person, number, gender and tense. Thus நான், நீய், அவர்கள், அது, &c. வருவானேன், போவானேன், &c. Hence this phrase, அதேனென்றால், is properly, *if you seek, why, that?* and explained by *because*; there is another like this, அதேதென்றால், which means, *if you ask what is that?* and it is explained by, *that is to say*. Thus நான் சொன்னதைச் செய்யாதே யதேனென்றாற் செய்வா யாகிற் சாவதே நிச்சயம், *do not do what I said, because if you do, you will certainly die*. So நான் சொன்னதைச் செய்யாதே யதேதென்றாற் பாவிகளைச் சேராதே, *do not do what I said, that is to say, do not associate with sinners*. It may also be said, அதேனென்னில், and அதேதென்னில் and they signify the same.

4. ஆக்கும். This is a word, which if it be put after the sentence, is equivalent to the word, *perhaps*: thus திருட வந்தானாக்கும், *perhaps he has come, that he may steal*; அவன் நல்லவனுக்கும், *perhaps he is good* &c. But if this word is interposed in the sentence, it removes all doubt, and affirming emphatically, is equivalent, to the word

surely, certainly, indeed: thus புண்ணியங்களைச் செய்தாலாக்கு மீடேறுவாய், *if thou hast practised the virtues, and not otherwise, thou wilt surely be saved:* திருடவாக்கும் வந்தான், *he has come indeed, that he may steal;* இவனாக்கும் நல்லவன், *this is certainly a good man,* &c.

முன் பின், முந்தி, &c.

151 These words are not prepostitions as some call them, but are nouns which are declined: and three cases are especially used, முன்னுக்கு, முன்னை, முன்னால்; பின்னுக்கு, பின்னை, பின்னால். Of these முன் hormonises with *before,* or *before that:* thus other words derived from this முன்னே, முன்னையும், முன்பு, முன்னர். On the other hand பின் agrees with, *after,* or *after that:* thus also other words derived from this பின்னே, பின்னை, பின்னையும், பின்பு, பின்னர், பிறகு, பிற்பாடு.

1. All theses words, if they are put after a noun, require the genitive or dative: thus அதின்முன், அதுக்குமுன், *before that;* அதன்பின், அதுக்குப்பின், *after that,* &c. But if these words are joined to a verb, the first are united to the participle of the future; நான் சொல்லுமுன்னே, *before that I may speak,* or *might speak,* &c. The second are joined to the participle of the praeterite; நீயிதைச் செய்தபின், *after that thou hast done this,* or *now thou wilt have done it,* &c. And contrariwise they cannot be used, nor can it be said வந்தமுன்; nor வரும்பின், &c. But all indiscriminately may be joined to a verbal from the participles of the praeterite or the future, which is then used

either in the dative or in the genitive: thus நீய் வந்ததின், or வந்ததுக்கு முன், பின், *befor thou didst come*, or *after thou comest*, or *now thou wilt have come*: so நீய் வருவதின், or வருவதுக்கு, or better, வருவதற்குமுன், பின், *before that thou comest*, or *after that thou shalt*. *have come*, &c. Of these முன் with its derivatives, is also added, and much more elegantly, to the participle negative, taking away *da*; thus நீ யிதைச் செய்யாமுன்னே யிங்கே வா, *before that thou doest this, come hitheer*. It may also be added to the dative of the verbal from the negative participle: நீ யிதைச் செய்யாததுக்குமுன்னே, &c.

2. If these words are used absolutely without any case or at least beginning of a sentence, முன்னே, முன்னாலே, &c, they correspond with *heretofore*; பின்னை, பின்னே, &c. agree with *afterwards*, or even, *besides*: thus பின்னையென்ன, *besides what?* So முன்னே or முன்னாலேசெய்ததைச் சொல்லு, *tell, what thou* hast *done heretofore*.

3. They are used also for முன், or for the gerund முந்தி, or the *infinitive* முந்த, both from the verb முந்துகிறது, *to precede*. They are used, as முன், they dot however admit a genitive, but with a dative it is said, அதுக்கு முந்தி, or அதுக்கு முந்த, and it is well explained by, *before: that*, But if they are used absolutely or in the beginning of a sentence, they are the same as, *first*: or *before*; முந்தி, or முந்த விதைச் சொல்லு, *tell this first*, or *before*, &c. and then they are often repeated, முந்தி முந்தி, or முந்த முந்த, &c., *principally, especially*.

படி.

152. This word is a noun which besides other things signifies, *the mode* or *manner,* and is well declined through all the cases: படியின், படிக்கு, படியை, படியில், படியால், படியோடு. And

1, They often use it absolutely in the nominative for the oblique cases, and instead of saying *e g.* படியிலே, they say படி: or with ē added படியே; and they unite that to any participle for any person; thus நான், நீய், &c. செய்கிறபடி, செய்தபடி செய்யும்படி, and properly it means, *in the mode in which I thou, do, doest: have done, hast done; shall do, shalt do,* &c. and it is well expressed by, *so as,* &c. And hence, they more elegantly, as I have often said, use the participle of the future for the present,

2. If படி comes in the dative' it implies the *end:* and is well expressed by, *that* thus நான் செய்யும் படிக்கு, *that: I may do it* &c.

3. If it occurs in the ablative of the cause, ஆல், it implies *cause*; and is expressed by *because* thus நீய் செய்தபடியினால் *because thou hast done,* &c. In this mode, it is often joined to the participle ஆன, from the verb ஆகிறது, and it becomes, ஆனபடியினாலே, *because this is. since this is:* and thus it is used absolutely even in the beginning of a sentence, and is well expressed by, *wherefore, on which account, on that account.*

4. Finally from this noun படி are those words, which I have often adduced; இப்படி, *in this way*; அப்படி, *in that way*; எப்படி, *in what way?* எப்படியும், *in whatever way*; இப்படிக்கொத்த, *of this way*, &c.

உள்

153. This word also is a noun, which is declined, உள்ளின், உள்ளுக்கு, &c., and signifies the *inner part*; thus உள்ளுக்கு மருந்து தந்தான், *he gave medicine to be taken inwardly*, in the manner of food or drink; so உன்னுள்ளும் புறமுமண்டவ ரறிவார், *God knows, what you have, within and without*.

1. But they use this word also absolutely in the nominative for the oblique cases, and often add ē, உள்ளே. And if it is used with a Genitive or Dative, after which it is placed always, it is equivalent to the propositions, *between* or *within*: thus வீட்டினுள்ளே, *within the house*: பெட்டிக்குள்ளே, *within the chest*: அவர்களுக்குள்ளே, *between them*: &c.

2. It may be used absolutely in the beginning of a sentence, and then is the same as, *within*: thus உள்ளேயொன்று மில்லை, *there is noting within*, &c.

3 This noun, உள், is joined to the verb படுகிறது, or ஆகிறது; thus உள்ப்படுகிறது, or which is the same, உட்படுகிறது, and, உள்ளாகிறது, and then it properly signifies *to become within*, i.e. *to enter*: thus கோட்டையுட்பட்டான், or கோட்டையினுள்ளானான், *he entered the citadel*. Hence metaphorically it is, *to agree with any one*, or *to asso-*

ciate with him: thus எனக்குட்பட்டான், or எனக்குள்ளானான், *he agreed with me*, or *he associated with me, he took my part*, &c But if it be joined to the verb, படுத்துகிறது, or ஆக்கிறது, it has an active sense, *to cause that one may assent*, &c.

அப்புறம், அப்பால், &c.

154. 1. The nouns புறம், and பால், besides other things signify *a part*; hence இப்புறம், இப்பால், *this part;* அப்புறம், அப்பால், *that part*, may be declined, and it may be said, *e g*. இப்புறத்திலே, இப்பாலிலே, &c. They are generally used indeclinably with a dative and then இப்புறம், இப்பால், equals the word, *citra, on this side* அப்புறம், அப்பால், the word *ultra, beyoud*: thus ஆற்றுக்கிப்புறம் or இப்பால், is, *on this side the river*, ஆற்றுக்கப்புறம், or அப்பால், *beyond the river* &c. Sometimes they are used absolutely in the beginning of a sentence, and are then well expressed by *nearer, farther*: thus அப்புறஞ் சொல்லு, *tell farther:* இப்புறம் வா, *come nearer;* அப்பாலே போ, *depart farther;* இப்பாலே வை, *put in nearer*, &c.

2. The word புறம் signifies also expressly *the exterior part*, and is opposed to the word உள், which is the *interior part*: whence it is said, உள்ளும் புறமும், &c. Hence this noun, if it be used in the ablative இல், புறத்திலே, or in the manner of an adjective, புறத்து, signifies, *without, out of doors*, and is either used absolutely, or with a dative; thus, புறத்திலே யிதைச் சொல்லாதே, *thou mayest not say this out of doors;* so, புறத்தாவலாதிகளை யிங்கே சொல்லாதே, *thou mayest not say here, the scandals, which are abroad;* so

வீட்டுக்குப் புறத்திலே போ, *depart out of the house,* &c. Hence comes the noun appellative, புறத்தியான், புறத்தியாள், *an external man, an external woman,* (that is an alien, of another country, a stranger.) and it is used generally for persons who are *not of the same blood.*

மேல், கீழ்

1.5 The noun மேல், even if it can be, almost never is, declined, but is used simply or with ē added, மேலே; and is always construed with a dative or genitive.

1. But it signifies properly, *the upper part,* as கீழ், or கீழே, *the lower part;* hence, that signifies, *above;* this, *below,* thus இதுக்குமே லொன்றுமில்லை, *above this there is nothing;* அறத்தின்மேல் நன்மை யில்லை, *there is no good above virue,* &c. so பாவிகளின் கீழினரில்லை, *a vile man is not below sinners.*

2. மேல் signifies *above, upon,* and then it is always joined to a genitive of dependance, or even to a noun substantive taken in the manner of an adjective; and since oftentimes the word of the nominative serves in the way of an adjective, as we stated at number 91, it is often joined to the word of the nominative; thus, என் தலைமேற் கொண்டேன், *I have put it upon my head;* so, வீட்டுமே லேறினான், *he ascended upon the roof of the house,* or வீட்டின் மேலே, &c. So அதின்மே லிது வை, *put this upon that.* In this sense also கீழ் is opposed to this word, and means *under;* but it is joined to a genitive or dative; thus, *e g.* இதின் கீழ், or இதுக்குக் கீழே, *under this*

3. மேல் is elegantly joined to a verbal from participles whice comes in the dative and more elegantly in the genitive: and then மேல் signifies, *more than, more emply than:* thus, நான் சொன்னதின்மேலே செய்தான், *he has, done more than I had said* &c. In this sense, its contrary is, *less than;* and to express this they use the infinitive குறைய, from the verb குறைகிறது, *to fail, to become less;* and it is used, as we stated at Number 136, absolutely, in the manner of an adverb, and requires a dative: thus, வேலை செய்ததுக்குக் குறைய வாங்கினான், *he received less than he labered for;* so, என்னாசைக்குக் குறையத் தந்தான், *he gave me less than I did desire,* &c. Hence.

4. By the reduplication of the word மேல், and from the union of the letter ல் with ம், that being changed into ன், comes மென்மேல், or மென்மேலும், and it signifies properly, *more and more:* thus நாளுக்குநாள் மென்மேலு மடையனா னான், *he become more and more stupid daily.*

5. Finally, மேல், is the same as, *afterwards, after that,* and is then used with a genitive or dative: thus, அதுக்குமே லிதைச் செய், *after that do this;* நீய் வந்ததின் மேலே சொல்வேன், *I will tell you after you have come,* &c.

மாத்திரம், அளவு, தனை.

156. The Tamulians distinguish four kinds of admesure ment: of the first kind are those things which we measure by number, as coins of money; of the second kind, those, which we measure by weight, as gold: of the third kind, the things which we measure by measures of capacity, as,

by a bushel, as grain: of the fourth kind, those which we measure e g. by extension, by the hand, by the ell, as length, breadth, height and depth.

1. For every kind of measure they use the word, மாத்திரம்: thus,

1) இப்பணை மெம்மாத்திரம், *how many are these coins?*

2) இப்பொன் னெம்மாத்திரம், *of what weight is this gold?*

3) இந்தத் தானிய மெம்மாத்திரம், *what quantity is this grain?*

4) நீள மெம்மாத்திரம், *how great a length?*
அகல மெம்மாத்திரம், *how great a breath?*
உயர மெம்மாத்திரம், *how great a height?*
ஆழ மெம்மாத்திரம், *how great a depth?*

Moreover they use the word அளவு, which serves for the other measures, excepting number, thus இப்பொன் னெவ் வளவு? இத் தானிய மெவ் வளவு? நீள மெவ் வளவு, &c. Finally, they use the word தனை, which however does not properly serve, except for those things which are numbered: thus *e.g.* பண மெத்தனை, *how many coins?* வருஷ மெத்தனை, *how many years?*

2. Of these three words, தனை, is never used simply without addition in the vulgar dialect; but it is either joined to the letters இ, அ, எ, instead of the article, as was stated at Number 50; thus, இத்தனை, *as much as this,*

அத்தனை, *as much as that,* எத்தனை, *how much?* or it is joined to the participle future, by changing உம், into அம், and adding to the word தனை the conjunction உம், and then it is the same as, *so long as:* thus, இருக்கந்தனையும், *so long as he may be, or shall be,* &c.

3. The word அளவு may be used by itself, and means *measure:* or it is joined to the above named letters, இ, அ, எ, by adding, according to the rule there given, a double வ; thus இவ்வளவு, அவ்வளவு, எவ்வளவு: or it is joined to the participle future, or to verbals of the three participles, by adding உம் to the word அளவு, and then it is the same as, *so long as:* thus it is said, நீ யிதைச் செய்யுமளவும், or செய்கிறதளவும், செய்ததளவும், செய்வதளவும், *so long as thou mayest do that, or so long as thou doest, hast done, shalt have dane, shalt do, that* &c. But if அளவு be used indeed in this way, but instead of adding உம், there be added to it the infinitive ஆக, it properly signifies, *to the measure, according to:* thus, *e.g.* நீய் செய்ததளவாகப் பலன் வரும், *according to that which thou mayest have done, will come the reward.* But in this way it is also joined to nouns in the dative; thus, என்னாசைக் களவாகத் தந்தான், *he gave according to my desire, to the measure of my desire.* &c

4. Finally, மாத்திரம், is a noun, which signifies *alone,* and is always put after another noun: thus நான் மாத்திரம் வந்தேன், *I have come alone.* It is sometimes well expressed by the adverb, *alone, only;* இதை மாத்திரஞ் சொல்லு, *tell this only,* &c. Moreover it is joined to the above mentioned

letters இ, அ, எ: இம்மாத்திரம், அம்மாத்திரம், எம்மாத்திரம், *so much as this, as that, how much?*

Finally, it is united to participles, and then is the same as if you said, *as soon as, immediately that;* and then it is better used in Ablative இல்: thus, நீய் செய்கிற மாத்திரத்திலே, செய்யுமாத்திரத்திலே, *immediately that, as soon as, thou doest, hast done, shalt do,* &c.

வரைக்கும், மட்டும்.

157. 1. The noun வரை means a *limit,* which word they use in the vulgar dialect only in the dative with the conjunction உம், and it becomes வரைக்கும், and it is the same as, *as far as, until, up to;* thus, இந்நாள்வரைக்கும், *as far as to this day;* இற்றைவரைக்கும், *until now;* கழுத்து வரைக்கும், *up to the neck,* &c.

2. The noun மட்டு also means a *terminus,* or *boundary,* and in this signification is used by itself in every case; thus மட்டில்லாதவன், *interminable;* மட்டோடிரு; *stand within the boundary,* &c. But if with the conjunction உம், it be added to any noun, this also signifies *until, up to;* thus இந்நாள்மட்டும், *until now,* &c. It is more elegantly jointed to a dative, அந்த ஊருக்குமட்டும், *as far as to that town,* &c. It is also said, இம்மட்டு, அம்மட்டு, எம்மட்டு, *so much as this, as that, how much?*

அதிகம்.

158. This noun corresponds with the word *more.* They generally use this noun indeclinably, and with a dative: அதுக்கிதுவே யதிகம், *this is more than that.* Hence if I wish

to say, *how much the more, so much the more,* then must be added to this noun, the particles which signify, *so much, how much,* of which see Number 156, ஓ being always added at the end of the first part of the sentence; *how much the more he increased, so much the more stupid he became;* I may express this by, எவ்வளவதிகம் வளர்ந்தானோ வவ்வளவதிக மடையனானான்: so, எம்மாத்திரம் பிட்சை யதிகந் தந்தாயோ வம்மாத்திர மதிக முன் செல்வம் வளரும், *by how much the more thou shalt give,* or *mayest have given, alms, by so much the more happy wilt thou be,* &c.

பார்க்க, காட்டிலும்.

159. To express the comparative, we have stated at Number 96, that they use the ablative இல், to which உம் is more elegantly added: thus, அதிலு மிது நல்லது, *this is better than that:* or they use the dative, as we stated at Number 93, thus அதுக்கிது நல்லது, *this is better than that,* &c. They use also for the comparative, these words, பார்க்க, பார்க்கில், from the verb பார்க்கிறது, *to look to,* which always require an accusative. The first word, since it is the infinitive, is here taken for the ablative absolute, according to the rule given at Number 120: hence அறத்தைப் பார்க்க நன்மையில்லை, means, *to those who look to virtue nothing else is good, i e. there is no greater good than virtue* பார்க்கில், is the subjunctive *if,* according to the rule, concerning which see Number 115: whence அறத்தைப் பார்க்கில், &c , is, *if thou lookest to virtue, i e. in comparison of virtue,* &c. In this sence they use also the word காட்டிலும், the subjunctive *although,* according to the

rule, Number 118, from the verb காட்டுகிறது, *to show*, hence, சாவைக் காட்டிலும் பாவமே தின்மை, is *although thou showest death itself*, that is *in sight*, *in comparison*, *of death itself, sin is undoubtedly evil*; which I may well render, *sin is worse than death itself*, &c.

உடனே

160. The word உடன், is a noun which properly is never used in the manner of a noun, but either absolutely at the beginning of a sentence with ஏ added at the end, and it is the same as, *immediately, quickly*: thus உடனே வா, *come quickly*, &c; or it is added to all the participles, and then signifies *immediately that, as soon as*; thus, நானிதைச் செய்கிறவுடனே, செய்தவுடனே, செய்யுமுடனே, *as soon as I do, have done, shall do, this*, &c. Or it is joined to a noun taken as an adjective, and then it is the same as the preposition, *with*: thus, கோபத்துடனே பேசாதே, *thou mayest not speak with anger*, &c. Or finally, without the ஏ at the end, it is joined to the verb படுகிறது, and becomes உடன்படுகிறது, and means *to assent, to agree with any one*, as if I should say, *to be in opinion with him*, and it requires a dative: thus, கடைசியி லவனெனக் குடன்பட்டான், *at length he agreed with me*; so பாவத்துக் குடன்பட்டான், *he consented to the sin*, &c. Finally, from this word comes ஒருங்குடன் from ஒருங்கு, which means, *all*, in the abstract; whence that phrase is the same as *with all*, and is well expressed by, *together*; ஒருங்குடனெழுந்தார்கள், *they rose up together*.

இல்லாமல், அல்லாமல், இன்றி, அன்றி,

161. இல்லாமல், or இல்லாதே, (the gerund from the defective verb இல்லை) means *without;* and அல்லாமல், or அல்லாதே, (the gerund from the defective verb அல்ல,) is *besides:* thus, உன்னையில்லாமல், or இல்லாதொன்றுஞ் செய்யேன், *without thee I will do nothing;* so இதல்லாமல் or இதல்லாதொன்றுஞ் செய்யேன், *besides this I will do nothing*. Which difference must be carefully observed. For one not knowing this, in this translation of the Gospel of St. John, where, speaking of the divine Word he says, *without him nothing was made,* has rendered it, இதல்லாம லுண்டானவாரியங்களி லொன்று முண்டானவில்லை; which is translated, *besides himself of these things which are, nothing was made.* Moreover for இல்லாமல் we say, இன்றி *without*, and for அல்லாமல் we say, அன்றி *besides*. All are construed with an accusative, or with a nominative.

ஆனாலும், &c. என்கிலும்.

162 ஆனாலும், or ஆகிலும், or ஆயினும், all these words are the subjunctive *although,* from the verb ஆகிறது, as we stated at Number 118.

1. If these words are prefixed to a sentence, they are the same as *but yet, however.*

2. But if these words are put after any part of a disjunction they correspond with, *or;* and in this sense and mode we use also the word என்கிலும், which is the subjunctive *although,* from the verb என்கிறது, *to say:*

(whence it is altogether a mistake of those who write எங்கிலும்:) thus we say, இவனாகிலு மவனெனகிலும், *or that man, or he,* &c.

3. The same particles if they are put afrer one only word, not repeafedly, but once, correspond with the Latin *vel,* when it is put for *at least, even*; thus அவனையாகிலும் வரச்சொல்லு, *say that he at least may come,* &c.

4. If finally they are added to words or doubt, they convey a sense disjunctively universal: thus எப்படி, in what way, *how?* எப்படியாகிலும், *in any way, in whatever way it may be:* so எப்போது, *when?* எப்போதாகிலும், *sometimes, whensoever it may be* &c. Whence they suffiiciently differ from the word உம்; forasmuch as this joined to the same doubtful expressions, conveys a sense entirely universal; thus எப்போதும், means *always;* எங்கும், is, *every where*: and எங்கேயானாலும், is, *somewhere*; எவனும், is, *all*; எவனாகிலும், is *some one, whoever it may be*, &c.

ஆம்

163. This is the third person neuter of the future from the same verb ஆகிறது, *to be,* declaring not existence but essence: hence, since we may use the word of the future, as we have often stated, even for the present, this word ஆம் is expressed by *it is,* or *it will be* In common use however,

1. When this word is used absolutely and by itself, it always corresponds with, *it is*: a word of one

affirming something, which they always use when the discourse is concerning the essence. Thus I inquire, *Is there any bread in the house?* when I ask of the *existence*; if there is, they do not say ஆம், but உண்டு, or இருக்குது; but if inquiring concerning the essence, I say, *what is in that chest, is it bread?* if it is they say ஆம்.

2. When this word is joined either to a noun or a verb, then in vulgar use it is taken, not for *it is*, but for, *it will be*: hence if it be spoken of a thing present, the expression *it will be* implies doubt, as in such a case also with the Latins Thus if to my inquiry, *what is there?* they reply, *e g*, அரிசியாம், it must be rendered, *it will be rice*: therefore it is the same as to say *I know not indeed, but I judge*, or *I have heard, that it is rice*. Thus when I ask, *has Peter come?* if they say வந்தானாம், it is, *it will be true, that Peter has now come, i e. I do not know indeed, but they say he has come*, &c.

3. But if the discours be of a thing future, then as the word *erit it will be*, in Latin, may imply doubt, or also certainty; so equally in this language the word ஆம். For example I say if thou doest this, the matter will be so and so; the other replies இப்படியாம், *it will be so*: then it implies not doubt but certainty But if the other person replies doubtfully, *it will be so, perhaps*; I may say in Tamul இப்படியாமாக்கும்; and generally when ஆம் is put after any verb, even concerning the future it appears to imply something doubtful; thus, வருவானாம், *he will come perhaps*, or, *they say that he will come*, &c.

4. If to the word ஆம் you add the letter ē, then, since this implies certainty and is equivalent to the word, *certainly*, as we stated at Number 149, whether the discourse be of a thing present or future, the word ஆமே, removing all doubt, affirms emphatically: அவனாமே, *certainly it is he;* வருவானாமே *certainly he will come*, &c.

5. Finally, from what has here been said, we may understand radically the force of that phrase, செய்யலாம், காணலாம், &c. For this as we stated at Number 109, is compounded from the verbal செய்யல், காணல், &c. and the word ஆம், that signifies *to do, to see*, &c., taken as a substantive; but ஆம், as I have said, signifies, *it is* or *it will be*. Hence those phrases are well rendered in Latin, *facere est, videre est, it is possible to do, It is possible to see*. Thus I render *hoc videre est apud auctores, it is possible to see this in authors*. இது கிரந்த கர்த்தர்க்களிடத்திலே காணலாம்: Whence those phrases are also well rendered, *it may be done, it may be seen*, &c.

ஒன்றில்.

181. This word is the ablative in இல், from the noun ஒன்று, *one;* but it is used in the vulgar dialect absolutely for *or*, and is always prefixed to any part of a disjunction: thus, ஒன்றிலிது ஒன்றிலது, *or this, or that*. Hence sometimes and especially in the high dialect, they use the word of the nominative itself, adding ē, ஒன்றே, for the same disjunction, *or;* and then it is always put after, and is more elegantly joined to verbals of the future: thus,

e g. பாவத்தை விடுவ தொன்றே நரகத்தில் வேவ தொன்றே, *or to part with sin, or to burn in hell*; understand, *it is necessary*. This mode is very elegant, and although it is not used by the vulgar, it is neverheless well understood

போலே.

165. The word போலே, or போல, is from the verb போலுகிறது, as we said at Number 88, which signifies *to be similar to*; whence

1. those words are well expressed by *so as, as*, and are always put after an accusative; thus, சூரியனைப் போலே விளங்குவான், *he will shine as the sun*, &c.

2. If போலே be added to participles, by changing a short into ā long or by adding ā long to the participle future; then that word is the same as in Latin *statin ac, immediately that, as soon as*: thus *e g* என்னைக் கண்டாப் போலே சினந்தான், *as soon as he saw me, he was angry*: so, செய்கிறாப்போலே, செய்தாப்போலே, செய்யுமாப்போலே, &c. In this way it signifies also, as above, *as*: thus, நான் சொல்லுமாப்போலே சொல்லு, *say, as I say*, &c.

3. If the same word be added to the subjunctive *if*, it is the same as, *as if, in the manner*: thus, என்னை நகைத் தாற்போலே பேசுகிறாயோ, *dost thou speak as if thou wert laughing at me? or in the manner of one laughing at me?* In this sense some reject the ற and write double ப, as is done, when it is joined as we have said, to participles; and they write, *e g.* நகைத்தாப்போலே, which is certainly a

barbarism: for since it comes from the subjunctive *if*, நகைத்தால், the ல cannot be lost, but only changed into the consonant ற, when ப follows, according to the rule at Number 20, and it must be written, either நகைத்தால்ப் போலே, or நகைத்தாற்போலே, *as if thou didst laugh at*, &c.

இடைவிடாமல்.

166. This phrase is well expressed in Latin by *continuation, sine intermissione continually, without intermission*; for it is from the noun இடை, *a middle*, and from the gerund, விடாமல், *by not leaving*, and means, *a middle not being left, without intermission*, &c.

இல்லாவிட்டால், &c.

167. This phrase is well expressed in Latin by *aliter, otherwise*: for it is from the gerund இல்லா, of the defective verb இல்லை, to which is added the word of the subjunctive from the verb விடுகிறது, which serves here for elegance only. Whence the simple word of the subjunctive of that verb might signify the same thing which word is இல்லாதால், and properly signifies, *if it is not, or will not be*: thus இதனால்ப் போ இல்லாவிட்டால்ப் போகாதே, *if this is, depart, if it is not*, that is, *otherwise thou mayest not go*; so I might say. இல்லாதால்ப் போகாதே, &c.

ஒழிய. தவிர.

168. I stated at Number 136, that the Tamulians use the word of the infinitive of some verbs in the manner of an adverb. It seems right here, in addition to what was said,

to adduce some others, which are used for adverbs or prepositions, and which are more necessary for use. Let the first be the Infinitive ஒழிய with the first short, from the verb ஒழிகிறது, *to fail, to die.* But since at Number 120 I stated that we may use the infinitive for the ablative absolute, hence this infinitive ஒழிய is well expressed by the ablative absolute, *failing*: thus இதொழிய வேறே வகை யில்லை, means, *this medium failing, there is no other;* or it is also well expressed by the particle *except, unless; there is not a medium except this.* So this proposition, *unless; thou wilt come I will not give this,* is well rendered, using always the work of the subjunctive *si*: நீய் வந்தாலொழிய யிதைத்தரமாட்டேன், &c. In the same way they use the infinitive தவிர from the verb தவிருகிறது, *to take away; to relinquish;* hence உன்னைத்தவிர வதுக்கானவ ரொருவரு மில்லை, is expressed, *thee being taken away,* or, *thee being left, besides thee, there is no other suited for these things, &c.*

ஒருப்பட. ஒருமிக்க.

169. ஒருப்படுகிறது or ஒருமிக்கிறது, means, *from many to become one*: hence they elegantly use the infinitives absolutely in the manner of the adverb, *conjointly, together, at the same time.* I stated at Number 141, that ஆக signifies, *together*; still they use this only when many things are enumerated, or many are referred to: thus இருவருமாக, *both together;* நானு நீயுமாக, *I and thou together,* &c. But they use the infinitives, which I have just adduced, even by themselves without another number; thus ஒருபட

வாருங்கொள், *come conjointly:* ஒரு மிக்கப் போனார்கள், *they departed together,* &c.: and I could not say, ஆக வாருங் கொள், ஆகப் போனார்கள், but there must be added, *e. g.* எல்லோருமாக வாருங்கொள், *come all of you together,* &c.

ஏறக்குறைய

170. This phrase is composed of two infinitives; ஏற, from the verb ஏறுகிறது, which besides other things signifies, *to increase,* neuter: and குறைய from the verb குறைகிறது, *to diminish,* neuter. Hence that phrase is well expressed by *more or less, about* &c.

அற

171. Is the infinitive from the verb அறுகிறது, *to be cut off,* in a neuter sense. Whence if this infinitive be taken for the ablative absolute, *e.g.* சந்தேகமற, it is rendered, *doubt being cut off*: hence அற is well equivalent to the preposition, *without,* and it is said, *without doubt.* They sometimes use this word absolutely, and it is then equivalent to the adverb, *perfectly, entirely,* as if one said, *all defect being cut off:* thus அறப்படித்தவனல்ல, *he is not perfectly learned;* So அறக் கெட்டுப்போனேன், *I was entirely undone.*

சூழ

172. Is the infinitive from the verb சூழுகிறது, *to surround:* which infinitive they use absolutely, and then it is equivalent to the word, *around,* or it may be taken as an adverb, or a preposition: thus சூழ வெங்கே நீ யிருந்தா

லும், *around; wherever thou mayest have been,* &c But what is equivalent to a preposition, it requires an accusative: thus **என்னைச் சூழ வாருங்கொளி,** *come ye around me,* &c.

கிட்ட

173. The infinitive from the verb **கிட்டுகிறது,** *to approximate,* in a neuter sense. It is taken absolutely for, *near:* thus **கிட்டவா,** *come near,* &C. It is used also as the preposition, *near near to,* and then requires a dative and sometimes a genitive: thus என் கிட்ட **வா, அதுக்கு கிட்ட வா, அவனைக் கிட்டப் போ;** *come me; near put it near that; go near him* &C.

விலக

174. The infinitive from the verb **விலகிறது,** *to shun, to recede.* Wherefore it is well taken absolutely for, *afar off,* thus **விலகப்போ;** *depart afar off, recede,* &c.

கடுக. முடுக.

175. The infinitive from the verb **கடுகிறது,** *to make haste,* neuter. Whence it is well equivalent to the adverb *hastily, quickly*: thus, **கடுக வந்தான்,** *he came hastily:* **கடுகச் சொல்லு,** *tell quickly.* In this way they use also the infinitive **முடுக,** from the verb முடுகிறது, which equally is, *to hasten;* **முடுகப் போனான்,** *he went hastily.* To these is opposed **மெள்ள,** and this is taken for *slowly;* thus **மெள்ளச் செய்பவன் நன்றாய்ச் செய்வான்:** *who acts slowly; acts well,* &c.

வலிய

176. The infinitive from the verb **வலிகிறது,** which besides other things signifies, *to be impelled,* in a neuter sense,

i.e, by one's self: as வலிக்கிறது is *to impel,* actively. Hence, வலிய, taken, as I have often stated, in the manner of the ablative absolute, is, *by his own impulse, spontaneously, voluntarily*: thus, வலியத் தந்தேன், *I gave spontaneously, motu proprio,* &c. Observe that there is another word வலிய, which comes not from any verb, but from the noun வலி, which signifies *fortitude,* and according to the rule, which I shall give in the Grammar of the more elegant dialect, the noun by the addition of ய becomes an adjective, *brave, bold,* and then it does not double the following letter: thus, வலிய தலை தந்தான், with a single த, is expressed, *he gave a brave head:* but if with the த doubled, you say, வலியத் தலை தந்தான், it is, *he gave his head voluntarily, spontaneously*, &c.

மை.

177. Towards rendering this section more complete I will add here something concerning the word மை, which adds a certain special force and elegance to a sentence. Wherefore.

1. If this word be added to nouns substantive or adjectives, it causes, that what the noun signified in the concrete, it shall now signify in the abstract; thus *e.g.* from கன்னி, a *virgin,* comes கன்னிமை, *virginity;* from ஆண், *a man,* comes ஆண்மை, *virility;* from தனி, *alone* comes தனிமை, *solitude;* from பொது, *universal,* comes பொதுமை, *universality;* from புது, *new,* comes புதுமை, *newness, novelty,* &c. Hence since a miracle is always something new in

nature, புதுமை, is taken also for *a miracle*. From ஒரு, *one*, comes ஒருமை, *unity:* and so, not as many, but many more. Here appears the origin of that noun தன்மை, for it is from தன், an oblique case of the noun தான், himself, and மை; hence தன்மை is, as I may so say, *ipseity, the identity, the propriety* of anything, &c.

2. This same word மை may be united to the participles of the present or of the praeterite, and becomes a verbal. From இருக்கிற, comes இருக்கிறமை; from படித்த, comes படித்தமை; which verbal however is almost never used; except in the ablative இல் or ஆல் இருக்கிறமையில், *since it is;* இருக்கிறமையால், *because it is;* படித்தமையில், *since he has learned,* படித்தமையால், *because he has learned*: and in this manner it is used very elegantly.

3. Finally மை is joined to the negative participle, taking away *da*: thus from அறியாத, comes அறியாமை, and then it is used in every case, mood and signification of the absolute noun. Hence அறியாமை, is *ignorance:* from பொறாத comes பொறாமை, *impatience;* from நில்லாத, comes நில்லாமை, *inconstancy:* from இல்லாத comes இல்லாமை; *want, poverty,* &c.; which mode is easy and elegant, and universal.

CHAPTER V.

Of various things specially necessary for daily use.

SECTION I.

Of the Numbers.

178. For the more easy use of the candidates, I will here present the sign and names of the numbers; I will afterwards add a few rules relating to the numbers.

Sign.	Name.	Power.
க	ஒண்ணு or ஒன்று	1
உ	ரெண்டு or இரண்டு	2
௩	மூணு or மூன்று	3
௪	நாலு or நான்கு	4
௫	அஞ்சு or ஐந்து	5
௬	ஆறு	6
எ	ஏழு	7
அ	எட்டு	8
௯	ஒன்பது	9
ய	பத்து	10
யக	பதினொண்ணு or பதினொன்று	11
யஉ	பனிரெண்டு or பன்னிரண்டு	12
ய௩	பதின்மூன்று	13

Sign.	Name.	Power.
யச	பதினாலு	14
யரு	பதினஞ்சு or பதினைந்து	15
யசா	பதினாறு	16
யஎ	பதினேழு	17
யஅ	பதினெட்டு	18
யகூ	பத்தொன்பது	19
உய	இருபது	20
உயக	இருபத்தொன்று	21
உயஉ	இருபத்திரண்டு	22
உயந	இருபத்துமூன்று	23
உயச	இருபத்துநாலு	24
உயரு	இருபத்தைந்து	25
உயசா	இருபத்தாறு	26
உயஎ	இருபத்தேழு	27
உயஅ	இருபத்தெட்டு	28
உயகூ	இருபத்தொன்பது	29
நய	முப்பது	30
நயக	முப்பத்தொன்று மி.	31 &c.
சய	நாற்பது	40
சயஉ	நாற்பத்திரண்டு மி.	42 &c.

Sign.	Name,	Power.
ருய	ஐம்பது	50
ருயரு	ஐம்பத்துமூன்று மி.	53 &c.
சுய	அறுபது	60
சுயச	அறுபத்துநாலு மி.	64 &c.
எய	எழுபது	70
எயரு	எழுபத்தைந்து மி.	75 &c.
அய	எண்பது	80
அயசா	எண்பத்தாறு மி.	86 &c.
சுய	தொண்ணூறு	90
சுயஎ	தொண்ணூற்றேழு மி.	97 &c.
ள	நூறு	100
ளஅ	நூற்றெட்டு	108
ளசு	நூற்றொன்பது	109
ளய	நூற்றுப்பத்து	110
ளஉய	நூற்றிருபது	120
ளருய	நூற்றுமுப்பது மி.	130 &c.
உள	இருநூறு	200
ருள	முந்நூறு	300
சள	நாநூறு	400
ருள	ஐநூறு	500

Sign.	Name.	Power.
௬௱	அறுநூறு	600
௭௱	எழுநூறு	700
௮௱	எண்ணூறு	800
௯௱	தொள்ளாயிரம்	900
௯௱௧	தொள்ளாயிரத்தொன்று	901
௯௱௨	தொள்ளாயிரத்திரண்டு	902
௯௱௩	தொள்ளாயிரத்துமூன்று மி.	903 &c.
௲	ஆயிரம்	1000
௲௰	ஆயிரத்துப்பத்து	1010
௲௱	ஆயிரத்தொருநூறு	1100
௲௨௱	ஆயிரத்திருநூறு மி.	1200 &c.
௨௲	இரண்டாயிரம்	2000
௰௲	பதினாயிரம்	10,000
௨௰௲	இருபதினாயிரம்	20,000
௱௲	நூறாயிரம் or லக்ஷம்	100,000
௨௱௲	இருநூறாயிரம் or இரண்டு லக்ஷம்	200,000
௰௱௲	பத்துநூறாயிரம் or பத்து லக்ஷம்	1,000,000
௨௰௱௲	இருபதுநூறாயிரம் or இருபது லக்ஷம்	2,000,000
௱௱௲	நூறு லக்ஷம் or கோடி	10,000,000

So on upto ten millions, which number they themselves call நூறு லக்ஷம், or in one word கோடி, with the first syllable long.

179. They subdivide the integer most minutely: I will here, however give some only of these sub-divisionsr which are more in use. I will describe, in order, thei character or sign their name, and signification

Sign.	Name.	Power.	
வத	முந்திரை is three-hundred and twentieth part of the Integer,	$\frac{1}{320}$	
ந.	அரைக்காணி	$\frac{1}{160}$	$\frac{2}{320}$
௭	காணி	$\frac{1}{80}$	$\frac{4}{320}$
சப	அரைமா	$\frac{1}{40}$	$\frac{8}{320}$
கூ	முக்காணி	$\frac{3}{80}$	$\frac{12}{320}$
ப	மா or ஒரு மா	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{16}{320}$
ப௭	மாகாணி or வீசம்	$\frac{1}{16}$	$\frac{20}{320}$
லே	இரண்டு மா or இருமா	$\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{32}{320}$
ஞ	அரைக்கால் or இரண்டு மாவரை	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{40}{320}$

ந	மும்மா or மூன்று மா	$\frac{3}{20}$	$\frac{48}{320}$
ச	நாலுமா	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{64}{320}$
வ	கால்	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{80}{320}$
ஒ	அரை	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{160}{320}$
ஒத	முக்கால்	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{240}{320}$

This one thing must be noted; when, that is, these sub-divisions are joined to other numbers, or are used one with another, if a vowel follows, nothing is added; and if that vowel b *u*, it is struck out. But if a consonant follows, ē is interposed, Thus from ஒன்று and அரை, comes ஒன்றரை; from இரண்டு, இரண்டரை, &c. But from ஒன்று and கால், comes ஒன்றேகால்; so, காலே மாகாணி; so இரண்டே முக்காலே வீசம், &c.

180. But it must be understood

1. That the words of the numbers above given are nouns, which may all be used by themselves, and are declined through all the cases, as *unum, duo, tres* in Latin. Thus, *e.g.* a person has put down five apples; of these another has removed two, and says to a friend, ஐந்திலிரண்டையெடுத்துக்கொண்டேன், *from five I have taken two for myself,* &c. I will add here one thing concerning the number கோடி. This word signifies two things.

1) The said number, *ten millions*;

2) that which is *new*. Thus they call the web of cloth, which, having been cut off by the weaver, has not yet been washed, கோடி, with the first syllable long in the same way. But it should be observed according to the rules given in the first chapter, that if this word signifies any thing new, it is taken in the manner of an adjective, whence it doubles க, ச, த, ப, if they follow: but when it is a number, it does not double them. Thus I may say கோடி சீலை, and கோடிச் சீலை: but the first signifies *ten thousand thousands* of *webs*: &c. and the second, *a new web*· Hence it appears, with what care the rules must be attended to, which we gave at the beginning, commencing from Number 16, where we treat of the increase of letters.

181. 2. The said words of the numbers way, ad libitum, be put either before or after a noun: thus மூன்றெருது, or எருது மூன்று, *three oxen*. When they are put after it, there is no change made; but when they are put before it, the word ஒன்று can never be used; but in its place, the word ஒரு is to be employed, the first syllable of which is short, if ū long is not struck out; if it is struck out, ஓர் also may remain: which may happen, although a vowel does not follow: thus ஒரு மனுஷன், or ஓர் மனுஷன், *one man*: so பதினொரு குதிரை, or பதினோர் குதிரை, *eleven horses*, &c. The other words of the numbers, even when put before a noun, may in truth be used, without alteration; still, when they are placed first, they are, more

elegantly, altered in this way: from இரண்டு comes இரு: thus இருதலை, *two heads*; so இருபது, *twenty*, &c. From மூன்று, if a vowel follows, மூ remains; thus மூவரசர், *three kings*; so மூவாயிரம், *three thousands*, &c. But if a consonant follows, மு short is put, and the following consonant, whatever it may be, is doubled: thus, முக்கால், *three fourths*; so முக்காலம், *three times*; முப்பது, *thirty*; so முந் நூறு, *three hundred*. Nor may we write முன்னூறு: for then the same letter would not be doubled, but others would be substituted: forasmuch as the word நூறு begins, not with ன, but with ந; but முன்னூறு might be from the word முன் and நூறு, and then நூ is well changed into னூ, because the following is conformed to the condition of the preceding, whence it might mean, *the anterior*, or *former hundred*, &c. From நாலு comes நால்; and ல, is changed according to the following consonant: thus நாற் கலம், *four bushels*; so நாற்பது, *forty* &c. From ஐந்து, comes ஐம்; thus ஐங்கலம், *five bushels*; so ஐம்பது, *fifty*, &c. From ஆறு comes அறு; thus அறுகலம், *six bushels*; so அறுபது, *sixty*, &c. From ஏழு, with the first long, comes எழு with the first short: thus எழுகலம், *seven bushels*: so எழுபது, *seventy*. From எட்டு comes எண்: thus எண் கலம், *eight bushels*; so எண்பது, *eighty*, &c.

In Multiplication the numbers are generally used in this way; for which it must be known:

1. That they do not, as with us, multiply the large number by the smaller, but not the reverse: and they do not say, *e.g. thrice seven, but seven times three* &c. Al-

though in the more elegant idiom both ways are used indiscriminately.

2. In order to say, *e.g.* *seven times three,* I may indeed say, **ஏழு விசை மூன்று**, and all will understand it, but it would be a barbarism; and the sound wouldr bespeak the foreigner. But if I said **ஏழு மூன்று**, with the first long, it would be *seven* and *three,* that is to say, *ten*: but **எழுமூன்று**, with the first shorts, is *seven times three,* viz., *twenty one,* &c.

Wherefore beginning from ten, I will here in orde give the words which serve for multiplication of this kind:

பைத்துபத்து	நூறு	௱	10 × 10 = 100
பைத்தொன்பது	தொண்ணூறு	௯௰	10— 9— 90
பைத்தெட்டு	எண்பது	௮௰	10— 8— 80
பைத்தேழு	எழுபது	௭௰	10— 7— 70
பைத்தாறு	அறுபது	௬௰	10— 6— 60
பைத்தைந்து	ஐம்பது	௫௰	10— 5— 50
பைத்து நான்கு	நாற்பது	௪௰	10— 4— 40
பைத்து மூன்று	முப்பது	௩௰	10— 3— 30
பைத்திரண்டு	இருபது	௨௰	10— 2— 20
பைத்தொன்று	பத்து	௰	10— 1— 10

ஒன்பதுக்கொன்பது	எண்பத்தொன்று	அக	9×9=81
ஒன்பத்தெட்டு	எழுபத்திரண்டு	எஉ	9—8—72
ஒன்பத்தேழு	அறுபத்து மூன்று	சுங	9—7—63
ஒன்பத்தாறு	ஐம்பத்தி நாலு	ருச	9—6—54
ஒன்பத்தைந்து	நாற்பத்தைந்து	சரு	9—5—45
ஒன்பத்து நான்கு	முப்பத்தாறு	ஙசு	9—4—36
ஒன்பத்து மூன்று	இருபத்தேழு	உஎ	9—3—27
ஒன்பத்திரண்டு	பதினெட்டு	யஅ	9—2—18
ஒன்பத்தொன்று	ஒன்பது	கூ	9—1—9
எட்டெட்டு	அறுபத்தி நாலு	சுச	8×8=64
எண்ணேழு	ஐம்பத்தாறு	ருசு	8—7—56
எண்ணாறு	நாற்பத்தெட்டு	சஅ	8—6—48
எண்ணைந்து	நாற்பது	சய	8—5—40
எண்ணான்கு	முப்பத்திரண்டு	ஙஉ	8—4—32
எண்மூன்று	இருபத்தி நாலு	உச	8-3—24
எண்ணிரண்டு	பதினாறு	யசு	8—2—16
எண்ணொன்று	எட்டு	அ	8—1— 8

ஏழேழு	நாற்பத்தொன்பது	சகூ	7 × 7 = 49
ஏழாறு	நாற்பத்திரண்டு	சஉ	7—6—42
ஏழைந்து	முப்பத்தைந்து	௩௫	7—5—35
ஏழு நான்கு	இருபத்தெட்டு	உஅ	7—4—28
ஏழு மூன்று	இருபத்தொன்று	உக	7—3—21
ஏழிரண்டு	பதினாலு	யச	7—2—14
ஏழொன்று	ஏழு	எ	7—1—7
ஆறாறு	முப்பத்தாறு	௩கூ	6 × 6 = 36
ஆறைந்து	முப்பது	௩ய	6—5—30
அறுநான்கு	இருபத்திநாலு	உச	6—4—24
அறுமூன்று	பதினெட்டு	யஅ	6—3—18
ஆறிரண்டு	பன்னிரண்டு	யஉ	6—2—12
ஆறொன்று	ஆறு	கூ	6.1——6

ஐயைந்து	இருபத்தைந்து	௨௫	$5 \times 5 = 25$
அஞ்ஞான்கு	இருபது	௨௰	5—4—20
ஐமூன்று	பதினைந்து	௰௫	5—3—15
ஐயிரண்டு	பத்து	௰	5—2—10
ஐயொன்று	ஐந்து	௫	5—1—5
நானான்கு	பதினாறு	௰௬	$4 \times 4 = 16$
நான்மூன்று	பன்னிரண்டு	௰௨	4—3—12
நாலிரண்டு	எட்டு	௮	4—2—8
நாலொன்று	நான்கு	௪	4—1—4
மும்மூன்று	ஒன்பது	௯	$3 \times 3 = 9$
மூவிரண்டு	ஆறு	௬	3—2—6
மூவொன்று	மூன்று	௩	3—1—3
ஈரிரண்டு	நான்கு	௪	$2 \times 2 = 4$
ஈரொன்று	இரண்டு	௨	2:1—2
ஓரொன்று	ஒன்று	௧	$1 \times 1 = 1$

182. 3. With us adjectives are formed from numbers, *first, second, third,* &c.: and so with the Tamulians: for which the rule is easy. Forasmuch as there is added the participle ஆம், from the verb ஆகிறது, which participle agrees with, *which is;* thus இரண்டாம், *second;* மூன்றாம், *third,* &c. For unity, however, the word ஒன்றாம் can by no means be used, since it signifies not *first,* but *only one.* But we must say, முதல், or முதலாம், *first:* for முதல் is, *a beginning.* In the other numbers however the word ஒன்று is used, and we must say ஓராம்; thus from பதி னொன்று, பதினோராம், *eleventh* இருபத்தோராம், *twenty-first* Hence, when the Latins speak adverbially, *primo, secondo, firstly, secondly,* &c., the Tamulians use the words of the numbers, adding for ஆம், ஆவது, the verbal from the same verb ஆகிறது, any say முதலாவது, *firstly,* இரண்டா வது, *secondly,* &c.: and this is literally rendered *which is first, which is second,* &c.

183. Here you may observe, that since முதல் means *a beginning,* they use three phrases.

1. முதலாய், which is well rendered, *or, even*: thus, நான் முதலா யறியேன், *even I myself do not know;* as if I said, beginning with me, I myself do not know.

2. முதலான, is well rendered, *and of this sort:* thus, பசி முதலான வாதைகள், *hunger and calamities of this sort,* for it is as if I said, calamities which are beginning with hunger.

3. முதற்கொண்டு: thus, இந்நாள் முதற்கொண்டு செய்யேன், *from this day, I will not do it,* that is to say, taking that day as the beginning, in future I will not do it, &c.

184. 4. From numbers the Tamulians form nouns appellative; thus, ஒருவன், or ஒருத்தன், *one,* Masc., ஒருத்தி, *one,* Fem. The others serve for either gender: இருவர், *both*; மூவர், *three;* நால்வர், *four;* ஐவர், *five.* For others are not in use in the vulgar dialect. But all these are in truth appellative nouns substantive, which can by on means be used in the manner of an adjective, and placed before another noun: thus I may not say இருவர் மனுஷர், but simply, இருவர், or அவர்களிருவர், &c.

185. 5. Finally, as in the Latin language we say, *singuli, bini, terni, one and one, two and two, three and three, &c.*, the words of the numbers, in the language, as far as *ten,* excepting the number *nine,* may be used in like manner. The Mode is this. The first syllable only of each number is repeated, which, if it be long, is made short, and if the number begins with a vowel, two *vv,* consonants, are interposed; except in the number *five,* in which only *v* is to be interposed; but if it begins with a consonant, then, whatever it is, is doubled; thus, from ஒன்று comes ஒவ்வொன்று; from இரண்டு, இவ்விரண்டு; from மூன்று, மும்மூன்று; from நாலு, நந்நாலு; from ஐந்து, ஐவைந்து; from ஆறு, அவ்வாறு; from ஏழு, எவ்வேழு; from எட்டு, எவ்வெட்டு; from பத்து, பப்பத்து; *one and one, two and two, &c.* From these by the rules given above, are formed appellatives taken in the manner of a substantive: ஒவ்வொருவர், *one and one*; இவ்விருவர், *two and two;* மும்மூவர், *three and three, &c.* And thus much of numbers.

SECTION II.

of Measures

186. The measures. of which I shall here speak, are those with which the Tamulians measure grain. They have themselves a certain kind of bushel, which they call கலம், *Calam,* and represent by this character, ள. If it be one bushel, they add க, by which character *one* is noted, as I have stated above, and they write, கள but if two, உள if three, ஙள &c. This measure, the same name being retained, a greater. and less, according to the difference of districts; but the கலம் is divided by all into twelve small measures, which they call மரக்கால், *Marcal;* or even better' குறுணி, *Curuni;* and this small measure is noted with this character, ங; but two of these measures are called not இருகுறுணி, but பதக்கு, and are note வங. But if there are three, முக்குறுணி, and are noted by ங; if four, தூணி, த; if five, ஐங்குறுணி, தங; if six, தூணிப் பதக்கு, தவங; if seven, எழுகுறுணி, தங; if eight, இருதூணி, உத; if nine, இருதூணிக் குறுணி, உதங; if ten, இருதூணிப் பதக்கு, உத வங; if eleven இருதூணி முக்குறுணி, உதங ;if twelve கலம், கள. Moreover

the twelfth part of the bushel, called குறுணி, is sub-divided into eight parts, of which each is called நாழி, *Nalhi,* and is noted by this character ௨, to which are prefixed the figures of the numbers: *e.g.* if there are two measures, ௨௨, இருநாழி; although some, entirely through mistake, call it ஈராழி; if three, ௩௨, முந்நாழி; if four, ௪௨ நானாழி; if five ௫௨ ஐநாழி; if six, ௬௨ அறுநாழி; if seven, ௭௨, எழுநாழி; if eight, ௮, குறுணி. Moreover the நாழி is divided into other eight parts: of these the eighth parts is called ஆழாக்கு, *Alhaccu,* and is noted by ஞ Two of these, which equal a fourth part of one நாழி, are called உழக்கு, and are noted by தெ which joined to the above said part, makes உழக்காழாக்கு, தெஞ, and are, three parts of the eight; but four parts of those eight, that is, the half of one நாழி, is called உரி, and is thus written, உரி. Five parts, உரியாழாக்கு, உரிஞ :but six, that is three quarters of one நாழி they call முவுழக்கு, ா-த! seven, முவுழக்காழாக்கு, ஈதஞ; eight parts, நாழி. The ஆழாக்கு is divided beside into five parts, which are called *Suvadu,* each one of which is denoted by ஞ௨; which sign is placed after the figure of the number, as

expressed in the Table below. Some instead of saying குறுணி, as I alluded to above, say மரக்கால்; for நாழி, படி; and for ஆழாக்கு, say அரைக்கால்ப்படி; for உழக்கு, கால்ப்படி; for உரி, அரைப்படி; for மூவுழக்கு, முக்கால்ப்படி, &c. Which however sound barbarously: and although the mode, which I have adduced above, is in fact from the more elegant dialect, still it is so common, that it is ordinarily used even by the women. But all the said subdivisions of the measures, since they bear relation to the first, that is, the கலம், and this according to the difference of districts, is greater or less: thouse also, while they do not diminish in number, are greater or less one with another. Here however I will give successively their names and the figures or characters by which they are expressed.

க௫உ	ஒருச்சுவடு	1 Suvadu.
உ௫உ	இருச்சுவடு	2
ங௫உ	முச்சுவடு	3
ச௫உ	நாற்சுவடு	4
௫	ஆழாக்கு	5 Suvadu 1 Alhaccu.
தெ	உழக்கு	2
தெ௫	உழக்காழாக்கு	3
உரி	உரி	4
உரி௫	உரியாழாக்கு	5
ஙத	மூவுழக்கு	6

நதளு	முவுழக்காழாக்கு	7
உ	நாழி	8 Alhaccu 1 Nalhi.
உஉ	இருநாழி	2
நஉ	முந்நாழி	3
சஉ	நானாழி	4
ருஉ	ஐந்நாழி	5
சாஉ	அறுநாழி	6
எஉ	எழுநாழி	7
ங	குறுணி	8 Nalhi 1 Curuni.
ெங	பதக்கு	2
ந	முக்குறுணி	3
த	தூணி	4
தங	ஐங்குறுணி	5
தெங	தூணிப்பதக்கு	6
தந	எழுகுறுணி	7
உத	இருதூணி	8
உதங	இருதூணிக்குறுணி	9
உதவங	இருதூணிப்பதக்கு	10
உதஙவ	இருதூணி முக்குறுணி	11
சா	கலம்	12 Curuni 1 Calam.

This one thing I add, that when the noun கலம் is joined with any of the above named fractions, ம் is always changed into ன், and ē is added, whether a consonant, or a vowel follows; thus they say, *e.g.* இருகலனே தூணி, and முக்கலனே யிருதூணி, &c., and it would be quite barbarous to say, இரண்டு கல நாலு மரக்கால், and மூன்று கல மெட்டு மரக்கால், &c., although they signify the same thing.

SECTION III.

Of the Names of the Degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity

187. Since it is necessary for daily use, especially for Missionaries, to know the names, by which the Tamulians express the degrees of consanguinity and affinity, I will here add a short catalogue of them.

Consanguinity and Affinity they call by the common word முறை and sometimes உறவு; whence that I may inquire, *what degree of consanguinity or affinity is there between you?* I may say உங்களுக்குள்ளே முறையென்ன? But the several Degrees are expressed generally by these nouns.

தகப்பன், அப்பன், &c. is the *Father*, and *Father's Brothers*. of these he who is *older than the Father*, is called also, **பெரியப்பன்**; he who is *younger*, **சிற்றப்பன்**.

தாய், ஆயி, அம்மாள், &c. is the *Mother*, and the *Mother's Sisters*: of these she who is *older than the Mother*, is called **பெரியாயி**; she who is *younger*, **சின்னாயி**; by this name they call also the *Step-Mother*.

பாட்டன், *Grandfather*, by the Father or the Mother.

பாட்டி, *Grandmother*, by the Father or the Mother. If she is by the Father she is called also, **அப்பாயி**: if she is by the Mother, **அம்மாயி**.

அத்தை, *Father's Sister*, or *Wife's Mother*, or *Husband's Mother*.

அம்மான், தாய்மாமன், *Mother's Brother*..

கூடப் பிறந்தவர்கள், சகோதரர்கள், *Brothers* and *Sisters*, by the same Father and Mother.

அண்ணன், தமையன், *Elder Brother*, either by the same father and mother; or son of the brother of one's own father, or of the sister of one's own mother.

தம்பி, a *Younger Brother*, in the way just mentioned.

அக்காள், தமக்கை, ஆச்சி, an *Elder Sister*, in the same way.

தங்கச்சி, தங்கை, a *Younger Sister*, with the same extension.

மச்சினன், *Husband* and *Wife's Brother*, respectively one with the other; or even *first cousins*, who are born not of two brothers, or two sisters, but of a brother and a sister.

மச்சினிச்சி, *Wife's Younger Sister*, or a woman born of the sister of one's own father, or the brother of one's own mother.

கொழுந்தி, *Wife's Sister*, being *older than her*.

கொழுந்தன், *Husband's Brother*.

நாத்துனார், *Husband's Sister*.

புருஷன், பத்தா, ஆம்புடையான், &c., *Husband*.

பெண்சாதி, பெண்டாட்டி, இஸ்த்திரீ, &c., *Wife*.

சகலன், those *who have married two sisters*, are mutually so called.

ஓய்ப்பிடியார், ஓரகத்தி, those *who have married two brothers,* are mutually so called.

சக்களத்தி, *many wives* are mutually so called, when one may have either at one time, or may have separately.

மாமன் and மாமி, *Husband's* or *Wife's Father* and *Mother.*

மருமகன், and மருமகள், *Son-in-law,* and *Daughter-in-law* or also with respect to a man, his *Sister's son,* and *Daughter*: but with respect to a woman, her *Brother's Son* and *Daughter.*

மகன், and மகள், *Son,* and *Daughter,* either one's own; or with respect to a man, his Brother's; or, with respect to a woman, her Sister's.

பேரன், and பேத்தி, *Grand-son* and *Grand-daughter,* as well in the direct line, as in collaterals.

பங்காளி, *Cousins*, sons of two brothers.

I shall here add this only: that the Tamulians very frequently join to these nouns this word, ஆர், which here implies not interrogation, but respect. Thus they say, தகப்பனார், தாயார், மாமனார், மாமியார், தமையனார், தமக்கையார், &c.

SECTION IV.

Of the Days, Months, and Years.

188. The *Day* is expressed in this language by five nouns, which it is not allowable to use promiscuously. If Day be taken in distinction from night, they say பகல்: thus பகலு மிராவுமாக, *by day and by night.*

But the *Day of twenty-four hours* is called, either நாள், or கிழமை, or தேதி, or திதி; with this distinction however, that நாள் is the day, taking it from the month, the week, &c.: thus *I came after the fourth day,* I may say, நாலாநாளுக்குப் பிறகு வா.

கிழமை is taken especially for the *Day of the Week,* for which they also say, வாரம்; thus *on what way didst thou come, on Wednesday, or Saturday?* I may render this in Tamul, எந்தக் கிழமையில் வந்தாய் வெள்ளியோ சனியோ? and in this sense it were a barbarism to say, எந்த நாள், &c.

தேதி, the first syllable of which is long, is taken specially for the *Day* with respect to the *Month*: thus. *today is the fourth of the month,* இன்றைக்கு நாலாந் தேதி; and it were a barbarism to say, இன்றைக்கு நாலா நாள், or நாலாங் கிழமை; nor would our idea be understood from this phrase.

Finally, திதி, is taken specially for *Day of the Moon's Age;* whence in order to say, *what day is today from the new moon?* I must say, இன்றைக் கெந்தத் திதி? &c.

Moreover the Day is here divided, not into twenty-four hours, but into sixty, which they call நாழிகை: and every நாழிகை is sub-divided into three hundered and sixty parts, which they call நொடி or விநாடி; whence since two and a half Tamul hours correspond with each of our hours, it follows that the Tamulians give to each of our hours nine hundered நொடி, whence every நொடி contains *four seconds*. But they themselves reckon thirty நாழிகை, or hours, from sun-rise to sun-set; and from sun-set to sun-rise another thirty: whence it happens, that in the Summer season the hours of the day are longer than those of the night; and the contrary, in the Winter season: for they always keep the number of hours the same. Moreover they divide the day into four equal parts, and the night into other four, which they themselves call, சாமம்; or even better, யாமம்; giving to each seven நாழிகை and a half, that is to say, three of our hours, When however they say simply, சாமம் or நடுச் சாமம், they always understand *midnight*.

	Hrs.	Min.	Sec.
1 நொடி	"	"	4
360 நொடி = 1 நாழிகை	"	24	"
60 நாழிகை = 1 நாள்	24	"	"

189. But as regards the *Days of the Week*, which, as I have said, they name கிழமை, and sometimes வாரம், the Tamulians also reckon seven, and they name them from the seven planets, which are called கிறகம், in the same order that we are accustomed to, adding to the name of the planet the word கிழமை: thus,

நாயிறு,	*the Sun:*	நாயிற்றுக்கிழமை,	*the day of the Sun:*
திங்கள்,	*the Moon;*	திங்கள்க்கிழமை	*the day of the Moon.*
செவ்வாய்	*Mars:*	செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை,	*the day of Mars.*
புதன்,	*Mercury:*	புதன்கிழமை,	*the day of Mercury.*
வியாழம்,	*Jupiter:*	வியாழக்கிழமை,	*the day of Jupiter.*
வெள்ளி,	*Venus:*	வெள்ளிக்கிழமை,	*the day of Venus.*
சனி,	*Saturn:*	சனிக்கிழமை,	*the day of Saturn.*

There is no name for *Week* in this Language.

190. *Month* is in Tamul called மாசம் or மாதம், or [illegible]தை. The Tamulians also reckon twelve months, and begin from the month April. They agree with us as to the days of the years, but not of the months; in the number of which days they do not even appear to agree with themselves: forasmuch as a month, which in this year, *e.g.* reckons 32 days, in the past year, reckoned 31, &c. In same degree that one month increases, another decreases in that year; whence the circle of the days of the year does not vary the number. They say, that they take the beginning of each month, from the entrance of the Sun into each sign of the Zodiac, beginning as we do from Aries. But they take, not the astronomical, but the

stellar signs; in this also however they wonder, and differ much from our reckoning. Their monrh begins always, after the seventh, and before the twelfth or thirteenth day, of our month. Whoever desires to know these matters thoroughly, may see a little work which I have written on the Indian years and months, where I give the principles of their astrology, and supply tables for easily finding the beginning of their months for every year.

The Names of the months are;

சித்திரை,	—	*April,*	அற்பசி,	—	*October,*
வையாசி,	—	*May,*	கார்த்திகை,	—	*November,*
ஆனி,	—	*June,*	மார்கழி	—	*December,*
ஆடி,	—	*July,*	தை,	—	*January,*
ஆவணி,	—	*August,*	மாசி,	—	*February,*
புரட்டாசி,	—	*September,*	பங்குனி	—	*March.*

And thus much concerning the months.

191. The *years* is called வருஷம், and is noted by a character ௵: simtimes also it is called ஆண்டு. But the years of age of men: animals, &c., cannot be expressed by these names: but they express them by the noun வயசு, or more elegantly வயது, er even பிராயம்: whence if I wish to say, *this person has ten of age,* I may say, இவனுக்குப் பத்து வயதுண்டு, or பத்துப் பிராயமுண்டு. But if I

wish lo say *there are ten years from that in which he was born,* I may say, இவன் பிறந்தது பத்து வருஷமாச்சு, &c.

192. The Tamulians have a certain kind of Cycle, which consists of sixty years, of which each one is marked by a peculiar name, which names I will give in their order adding the numbers of our years, which correspond with them.

1	பிறபவ	வருஷம்	1807
2	விபவ	"	1808
3	சுக்கில	"	1809
4	பிறமோதூத	"	1810
5	பிறசோற்பத்தி	"	1811
6	ஆங்கிரச	"	1812
7	ஸ்ரீமுக	"	1813
8	பவ	"	1814
9	யுவ	"	1815
10	தாது	"	1816
11	ஈஸ்வர	"	1817
12	வெகுதான்னிய	"	1818
13	பிறமாதி	"	1819
14	விக்கிரம	"	1820
15	விஷு	"	1821
16	சித்திரபானு	"	1822
17	சுபானு	"	1823
18	தாரண	"	1824
19	பார்த்திவ	"	1825
20	விய	"	1826

21	சருவசித்து	வருஷம்	1827
22	சருவதாரி	,,	1828
23	விரோதி	,,	1829
24	விகுருதி	,,	1830
25	கர	,,	1831
26	நந்தன	,,	1832
27	விசய	,,	1833
28	சய	,,	1834
29	மன்மத	,,	1835
30	துர்முகி	,,	1836
31	ஏவிளம்பி	,,	1837
32	விளம்பி	,,	1838
33	விகாரி	,,	1839
34	சார்வரி	,,	1840
35	பிலவ	,,	1841
36	சுபகிருது	,,	1842
37	சோபகிருது	,,	1843
38	குரோதி	,,	1844
39	விசுவாச	,,	1845
40	பராபவ	,,	1846
41	பிலவங்க	,,	1847
42	கீலக	,,	1848
43	சவுமிய	,,	1849
44	சாதாரண	,,	1850
45	விரோதிகிருது	,,	1851
46	பரிதாவி	,,	1852
47	பிறமாதீச	,,	1853
48	ஆனந்த	,,	1854

49	ராக்ஷச	வருஷம்	1855
50	நள	,,	1856
51	பிங்கள	,,	1857
52	காலயுத்தி	,,	1858
53	சித்தார்த்திரி	,,	1859
54	ரவுத்திரி	,,	1860
55	துர்மதி	,,	1861
56	துந்துபி	,,	1862
57	ருதிரோத்காரி	,,	1863
58	ரக்தாட்சி	,,	1864
59	குரோதன	,,	1865
60	அக்ஷய	,,	1866

From this, returning again to the first, பிறபவ வருஷம் will be 1867, and so of the rest.

193. In this way the Tamulians name the years through the Cycle; but they take the numbers of them from the age of the World, which they feign to be much older than it really is. Forasmuch as they distinguish four Ages of the world, which by a common word they call யுகம், of which three having already elapsed, they say we are in the fourth. The first age of the world, which by themselves is called the age of Innocence, they name கிறேதா யுகம், and they assert it to have numbered 1,728,000 years. The second they call திறேதா யுகம், and to it, deducting a fourth part of the first age, they attribute 1,296,000 years. The third they call துவாபர யுகம், and deducting a third part of the second age, affirm it to have

endured for 864,000 years. Finally, the fourth, which is the present, they name கலியுகம், as though they would say the *age of misfortune*: and which is said yet more foolishly, the Tamulians state that this deducting the half of the third age, will last 432,000 years, whence this has not come more than the fourth part of the years of the first age. But this 1728th year from the Birth of Christ, at the end of which I write these things, is according to the Tamul calculation, the 4,829th year complete of this last age: for they always reckon the year as passed and complete. Hence it follows, that in this year, in which the earth does not yet number six thousand years, they assert that 3,892,829 years have elapsed since the creation of the world. In like manner they fable all other things also: since, having in fact no history, they put faith in the figments of poets, just as if they were histories. Wherefore, they note the years in this way: since this year will be called கீலக வருஷம் they say, கலியுகத்தில் ௪௲௮௱௨௯- -மாண்டு கீலக வருஷம், that is to say, *the 4,829th year of the age Caliyug, called Kilaga varuxam;* that however which will begin in the coming month of April, will be the 4,830th year complete, called, சவுமிய வருஷம்; and so of the rest. This mode they observe, in their, if I may so say, Almanack, பஞ்சாங்கம்.

The Indian Astronomers follow another way of counting the years. They take an Epoch from the year the death of a certain king being called *Sālivāganan*, who

died in the year of Christ 78, which was the 12th of the Indian Cycle, called வெகுதானிய வருஷம்; and therefore there wanted to the completion of that Cycle 49 years; besides which this year 1728 is the 42nd year of the 27th Cycle, as is evident. But all their astronomical observations are made according to this reckoning. They call this Epoch *Sālivāgana Sagāptam*; from the name, that is. of that king, and from *Sagam*, the name of his kingdom, and finally from *aptām* which in Sanscrit means *a year;* as if they would say, *the year since Sālivāaganan reigned.* But the Tamulians since they can neither write in their own characters, nor pronounce with the mouth the word *Sagāptam*, write and say, *Sagārtam.*

194. பஞ்சாங்கம், is a noun composed from பஞ்ச, and அங்கம், *members:* but in composition from the concurrence of two short *a a*, one of them becomes long, and it is pronounced பஞ்சாங்கம். This book is called *five members,* because five things are therein treated of.

1. திதி, *the day of the moon's age.*

2. வாரம், *the day of the week.*

3. நட்செத்திரம், *the constellation,* in which the moon is found daily, which thing they observe superstitiously.

4. யோகம், *good and evil days.*

5. கரணம், *auguries, horoscopes,* &c.

SECTION V.

Of the Compass the Signs of the Zodiac, and the Phases of the Moon.

195. The compass of the Winds they call திக்கு, or திசை: the four principal ones they names in this way, that is to say,

கிழக்கு or கீழ்திசை, means the *East.*

மேற்கு or மேற்றிசை, ,, *West.*

தெற்கு or தென்றிசை, ,, *South.*

வடக்கு or வடதிசை, ,, *North.*

To these which end in *u,* they often cutting this off, add ே: thus, கிழக்கே, மேற்கே, தெற்கே, வடக்கே. The four angles intermediate to these, which by a common word they call மூலை, they specially distinguish in this way:

தென்கிழக்கு, the angle *from the East to the South.*

தென்மேற்கு, the angle *from the South to the West.*

வடமேற்கு, the angle *from the West to the North.*

வடகிழக்கு, the angle *from the North to the East.*

196. They say that eight gods or demigods preside over these eight points of the Winds, which by a common word they name திக்குப் பாலகர்: as if they would say *the guardians of the points.*

Of these in the East is இந்திரன், *the chief of the Gods*
In the angle from E. to S. அக்கினி *the god of Fire.*
In the South இயமன், *the god of Death.*
In the angle from S. to W. நிருதி, The name of a certain king whom they greatly praise for his liberality.
In the West வருணன், *Neptune.*
In the angle from W. to N, வாயு, *Aeolus.*
In the North குபேரன், *Plutus, the god of riches.*
In the angle from N. to E. ஈசானியன், *i.e.* சிவன்; since ஈசானம் is one of the five faces which they give him.

Hence from those also they name the points and angles: thus சனி மூலை, ஈசானிய மூலை, the angle from E. to N., அக்கினி மூலை, the angle from E. to W., &c.

197. Moreover the Tamulians use the said nouns in the manner of an adjective, and join them to another noun; *e.g.* the *eastern,* the *northern* region, &c., the *eastern,* the *northern* sea, &c.; they then use the said words, as we have shown them joined to the noun திசை: thus, *e.g.* கீழ்த்திசை, *the eastern region;* கீழ்கடல், *the eastern sea;*

மேற்றேசம், *the western region*; மேற்கடல், *the western sea*; தென்றேசம், *the southern region*; தென்கடல், *the southern sea*; வடதேசம், *the northern region* வடகடல், *the northern sea*; So கீழ்பக்கம், மேற்பக்கம், தென்பக்கம், வடபக்கம், *the eastern, western, southern, northern part*, &c. They use this mode of speaking in describing any the least distance: on the same couch, *e.g.* if they wish to assign ang part, they do not say this part or that, but *e.g. sit to the South, sit to the East*, &c. Whence even boys and girls know these names perfectly; and if they wish to call one stupid, they say that he does not even know the points of the winds.

198. The Tamulians also recognise twelve Signs of the Zodiac, which by a common word they call ராசி, and they enumerate them in our order. But the names are these:

மேஷம்,	—	Aries,
ரிஷபம்,	—	Taurus,
மிதுனம்,	—	Gemini,
கற்கடகம்,	—	Cancer,
சிங்கம்,	—	Leo,
கன்னி,	—	Virgo,
துலாம்,	—	Libra,
விருச்சிகம்,	—	Scorpius,
தனுசு,	—	Arcitenens,
மகரம்,	—	Caper,
கும்பம்,	—	Amphora,
மீனம்,	—	Pisces.

These names taken from the Sanscrit language, correspond also in signification with ours: மிதுனம், how-

ever does not signify Gemini, Masculine, but Geminae, Feminine, (for they call them females, and name the one பாடவை, and the other பாடவளி:) and as we give one of the Twins, a club, and to the other an arrow; so the Tamulians give to one தண்டு, *i. e. a club*, but to the other யாழ், *i. e. a lyre.* Besides தனுசு, is not Arcitenens, *an Archer*, but simply *a bow.* மகரம் again is not a goat, but *a kind* of *Fish*, which their poets celebrate amongst things that swim, as remarkable as well for its greatness of body and mind, as for its reputation in warlike glory; and they also call it சுறா.

199. Concerning the *Changes of the Moon* some things are worthy of being known, and necessary for use. The *New Moon* they call அமாவாசை: but the *Full Moon*, பவுரணமி, or பவுரணமி யமாவாசை. They distinguish the increasing from the waning, which two seasons they call, in Sanscrit பக்ஷம், in Tamul பக்கம், that is *Parts.* The age of the Moon from the New moon to the Full moon is called சுக்கில பக்ஷம்: for சுக்கிலம் is *whiteness*, or even *light;* whence when the moon shines, after the New moon, at the beginning of the night, they call its age, *the Part which shines.* But the age of the Moon from the Full moon to another New moon is called கிஷ்ண பக்ஷம்; because கிஷ்ணம் means *blackness* or *darkness:* whence when after the Full moon the light of the moon does not appear at the beginning of the night, they call that, *the time of darkness.* Moreover the first part is called by another name, பூருவ பக்ஷம், the second அபர பக்ஷம்: forasmuch as

pūruvam, besides other things, signifies *a beginning*, whence they well call the part after the new moon, the *beginning of the moon;* but *abaram* signifies what is *posterior* in time, whence they well call the part after the full moon, the *posterior* in time. The *Days of the Moon* they call, as we have stated by the common word திதி; not reckoning however the day of the new moon, nor the day of the full moon; and beginning from day next to them, which they call the first day, they call the fourteen days from the new moon to the full moon, and from this to the new moon each by their own names from the Sanscrit language, which I shall here enumerate in order.

பிறதமை	—	1st day,
விதியை	—	2nd day,
தறிதியை	—	3rd day,
சதுர்த்தி	—	4th day,
பஞ்சமி	—	5th day,
ஷஷ்டி	—	6th day,
சப்த்தமி	—	7th day,
அஷ்டமி	—	8th day,
நவமி	—	9th day,
தசமி	—	10th day,
ஏகாதசி	—	11th day,
துவாதசி	—	12th day,
திறியோதசி	—	13th day,
சதுர்த்தசி	—	14th day,

Which nouns as I have said signify first, second, &c. day after the New moon; then after the Full moon; and a distinction is made, from the names of the *parts* which I mentioned above. Thus *e. g.* பூருவ பக்ஷத்திற் பஞ்சமி means, *the fifth day after the new moon*; அபர பக்ஷத்திற் பஞ்சமி means, *the fifth day after the full moon*; and so of the rest. Or to the days after the now moon they even add சுத்த, *i. e. bright, clear*: thus, சுத்த பஞ்சமி, *the fifth day from the new moon*: and to the days after the full moon they add, *bahula*, or in Tamul பகுள, that is *obscure*; thus, பகுள பஞ்சமி, *the fifth day from the full moon*, &c.

SECTION VI.

Of the correspondence of many of the Particles, Adverbs, &c. of the English Language with Tamul words.

200. For the more easy use of the beginners I will here give an Index disposed in Alphabetical Order, in which I will enumerate the principal particles of the *English* language, some of the adverbs, and other words of this sort, which greatly contribute to the elegance of a sentence. And of numbers, I will add which is in the margin, where they may easily find the word in the Tamul Idiom which corresponds with each word in *English.*

There will not be wanting perhaps some one to condemn one as guilty of giving these rules more at length than was requisite: I certainly shall not deny it, provided that he himself cut off what are superflous, and then say that I have written too much. Many things I have indeed stated, which are not immediately to be proposed to beginners, and much less to be recquired from them; which nevertheless, following the order of the subject, I have given in their proper place, lest they might afterwards be wanted: but it will be the duty of the Teachers, as I said at the beginning, to choose each for each, and to determine both the mode and time, when it may be expedient to read these. I however venture to exhort the Candidates of this language, that having now finished the reading of this Grammar, they set it aside; and, after one or two years, when they shall know enough to understand those who speak it and also themselves to speak expertly at large what may be understood by all, then that they assume this Grammar, and go through it attentively and I do not doubt, but that they may find it something new, and not to be despised. But I fear rather the reproach of brevity with those who are skilled in the language: forasmuch as I have left many things unmentioned; designedly however. lest the piled heap should crumble to pieces, ruined by its own weight. Moreover, I know, that, in every part of this country, the inhabitants use a definite peculiar mode of speaking, and severally reject many expressions, and add many: which however

I have not judged it necessary to give: forasmuch as in Europe also, he who would teach a foreigner the Italian language *e.g.* would be satisfied to teach him the common idiom, which the educated everywhere speak: and certainly would never propose to him, what, in every corner, the lowest people, either barbarously supplant or improperly suppress. And, in like manner, I have judged it right, that not the abuses of the ignorant, but the rules of the Tamul idiom, should be imparted to beginners. Let them know what may be said appositely, and they may be able to reprove even the Natives if they make mistakes; experience without labor will teach the rest.

FINIS.

A.M.D.G.

INDEX

Of the whole Grammar: in which the first is the Marginal Number, and the second, that of the Page.

CHAPTER I

Of the Letters.

CHAPTER II

Of the Noun and Pronoun.

CHAPTER IV.

Of Syntax.

CHAPTER V.

Of Various Things.